

Appendix

Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I suppose that a good many people become discouraged, as I do at times, at attitudes and positions taken by some of our fellow citizens who constantly seem to be apologizing for our country or who seem to be ashamed over a demonstration of honest-to-goodness, old-fashioned patriotism.

Happily, I do not believe such expressions reflect the depth of feeling of most Americans, and it is a pleasure to call to attention an editorial which appeared in the September 2 issue of the Black Hills Press, published in Sturgis, S. Dak.

The editorial was written by Mr. Robert Lee, the editor of the paper, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET 'EM WAVE

We heard a couple of patriotic speeches the other day, and we were deeply impressed by them.

We liked them for many reasons—and not just because many things were said that needed saying. The speeches were given before the local Rotary Club by George Moses and Joe Monroe of Rapid City. They are members of the Rapid City Chamber of Commerce's speaker bureau and their mission was to alert the local Rotarians to the Communist conspiracy. They did a very effective job of it too.

Most of us recognize that the Communists have never deviated from their publicly announced objective of eventual world conquest—by peaceful means if possible, by war if necessary. The pattern has been followed from Lenin to Khrushchev, and there has been no indications that it will ever change. Yet, too many of us fail to comprehend and we seem impotent to counteract this conspiracy that threatens to engulf us as it has so many other countries of the world.

What we liked most about these two speeches was that they were truly patriotic addresses—something you don't hear very often any more. There was talk about the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Bible and the free enterprise system—the cornerstones of America's meteoric rise to prominence among the nations of the world. It was refreshing to hear somebody actually boast about our capitalistic system for a change. It thrilled us to hear somebody challenge the American people to wake up to the dangers confronting our priceless heritage just as our founding fathers must have aroused patriotic fervor in our forefathers.

It was flag waving at its best, and we say there is need for far more of it. There have been too many apologists for our economic system and our hard-won heritage.

We agree with the speakers who said that Americans who want to trade our heritage for the kind of economic system that has led nation after nation to ruin are either Communists or plain stupid. The lessons of history are plain—if we will but read and comprehend.

We also agreed with the speakers when they pointed out that capitalism and communism cannot peacefully coexist as long as world conquest remains the objective of the Communists. We have seen no evidence to indicate a departure from this long-range goal of the Communists. In fact, there is ample evidence they are sticking to it with fervent tenacity.

Our capitalistic system, based on the principle of freedom of individual opportunity, has given us the highest standard of living in the world. Our gross national product, the value of all goods produced, exceeds that of every other country of the world. The most socialistic countries—and even the Communists with their slave labor camps and collectivism—have failed to match the productive power of the free enterprise capitalistic system.

In fact, our capitalistic system has brought us so many benefits that we can be generous in sharing them with countries whose own economic systems have relegated them to a beggar status. Many of them have accepted our extensive foreign aid while remaining critical of the system which has enabled us to extend it, despite the fact that their own system has failed to stand the test. But the poor have always been jealous of the rich, regardless of the merits of the wealth, and it will probably ever be thus.

SPIRITUALLY STRONG

While achieving this pinnacle of prominence among the nations of the world, America has retained its spiritual strength by continuing its faith in a power mightier than men and governments of men. America is a materialistic nation, but our spiritual values have been the motivating force for all the good that has been accomplished under our way of life.

We have rejected socialism and the welfare state because we recognize that in the long run they don't really help anybody. It was Lincoln who said, "You don't help the poor by destroying the rich," and that principle is as true today as when the great humanitarian coined the phrase. Yet, there are those in the country today who would junk the time-tested capitalistic system for the discredited socialistic form of government which has enabled the Communists to gobble up country after country.

If we need any proof that socialism and the welfare state is the harbinger of communism, there is ample evidence in the tragic decline of numerous countries. Unfortunately, there are people in America today who advocate the path that has led to ruin for these other countries. They would shelve the principles of the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the free enterprise system, and—yes, even the Bible—as old-fashioned and not applicable to our times.

But we say these principles will never become old-fashioned—that our Nation will follow these others to ruin only when we abandon them. We go along with Lenin who said that America will fall from within—if we let it. We must not let it happen.

But, to prevent it, we need modern patriots—citizens who will proudly wave the flag and rally us to it.

One speaker commented that the side which will win this historic struggle will not necessarily be the side that is morally right—but rather the side with the most dedicated followers. No truer statement was ever uttered. We know the Communists have many dedicated zealots. We need to counter with dedicated fighters for the capitalistic cause.

Our heritage was handed to us; now we've got to earn the right to keep it.

We congratulate the Rapid City speakers and the chamber of commerce there for reminding us of the need for eternal vigilance and courageous, patriotic action against the forces that would bury us. The threat is a very real one and it's high time we realized it.

The Rapid City speakers suggested that individuals can best combat the Communist conspiracy by learning all they possibly can about Communist objectives, methods, and strategy, and then standing up to vigorously defend our own capitalistic system against all challengers. We have much to crow about if we are patriotic enough to do it.

If that be flag waving, make the most of it.

Education or Destruction?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, while human beings, wherever you find them, have certain basic and similar characteristics, their ideas and attitudes can be influenced and molded by education. We hear a great deal about the progress in education in the Soviet Union and it is apparent that they have made strides in the field of science. It should also be remembered that the education of the young people in Russia is a state-controlled program and is used by those in control of the Government, who are all dedicated Communists to further the acceptance of the Communist philosophy. It is worth noting that while progress in the field of science has been made, it is very apparent that the socialistic philosophy, when applied to the production of basic necessities of life, has not been successful. Agricultural production in Russia has never come close to the fantastic ability of the American farmer under a free-enterprise system. Further, these great strides in the field of science have not been aimed to the use of science for peaceful means, as has our many advances thus far.

At this time of crisis in dealing with the saber-rattling Khrushchev, we Americans must bear in mind that the Russian people have been subject to an educational system which teaches what it wants the people to know and withholds what it wants kept from the people. If the Communists were really sure of

their system, they would not keep the Iron Curtain so tightly drawn around the countries under Communist absolute control. We must not confuse, in the name of education, true dissemination of knowledge and facts and the Communist concept of education which limits to its own interests the facts made available to those being "educated." Indoctrinated, in the Russian instance, is probably a much more realistic word.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Washington Daily News there appeared an article entitled "Education or destruction?" by Henry J. Taylor, which is an interesting commentary on Russian policies of withholding information from its people. I commend it to the Members of the House, and under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION OR DESTRUCTION?

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Our wartime North Atlantic convoys delivered Communist Russia complete chemical factories, steel-rolling mills, textile mills, tire plants, petroleum refineries, electric power stations and block-signal systems, not to mention \$1,647,000 worth of buttons. They were not sent or meant for war use. They were goodies to be used whenever peace came; like stored-up plums from Aunt Mary.

No conception of this or everything else we gave ever reached the Russian people. Nor, of course, has the Kremlin paid the vast sums in default.

I was present with Gen. Mark W. Clark in Vienna when an officer of the Soviet forces that met our troops there asked him in all seriousness: "General Clark, will you please tell me how your American Army got so many Russian jeeps?"

Russia never even made a horn's toot for a jeep. Yet even this officer thought the Soviet was on the giving end until General Clark dropped his soldierly gallantry and replied in a hurry.

We watch the excellent Bolshoi Ballet twinkle here, see Mr. Nixon in the kitchen or pictures of peasants in the fields and in other ways get the correct impression that, like average people everywhere, the Russian people mean well. But perhaps it is impossible for us to put ourselves in the position of a mass mind of 200 million people where a government controls every newspaper, radio, moving picture, billboard, loudspeaker, book, encyclopedia, library, training center, school, university and all sources of information, and has for over 40 years.

In our Western way, and thinking in terms of the objectives of our own education, we may feel dimly encouraged by the growth of Soviet education; and perhaps, as the Russians "know more," many may see through the vicious shams. But the Soviet little red schoolhouse remains the big Red arsenal. And it is not our friend.

We saw what happened to the young German millions in Hitler's little red schoolhouses. Hitler had only 7 years before 1939 to indoctrinate in nazism. The Communists have had 44; every Russian younger than 45 was born under the Red fraud.

Thus our thinking is vulnerable. Knowing the Soviet people are being better "educated," and consequently—such is our conclusion—more enlightened, we confuse our terms. To let Soviet propaganda impress us by the growth of education among the population in the straitjacket of indoctrination is like listening to a dancing master eulogize the waltz while he cuts off the pupils' legs. Our own educators should be very careful to straighten our public out on that fact and never praise a fraud.

Our truths when they do strike home—by radio, exhibits, people-to-people programs or other means—are immensely valuable for their limited effect and we must try to keep delivering the truth by every possible means. But Russia is an enormously diversified and very big country—11 time zones to our 4—and the truth must jump the deep trench of slanted history and generations of misinformation which has done there what Hitler did to German youth but for six times as long.

No education by us from far away or from within by the growth of schools can create any decisive break between the Russian mass mind and the Kremlin. Tyrants do many things badly but they are very good at self-preservation.

Visiting British Student Likes To Bounce Around

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Experiment in International Living has given many visitors from abroad the firsthand opportunity to learn about the United States and the people of the United States.

Their reactions often can be helpful to us as we try to analyze our own Nation and our own ways of doing things.

In my hometown, Westfield, N.J., a British engineering student and four others from Britain are getting a taste of American life. They are asking questions, learning, and even trying their hand at bowling. An article in the Newark Star Ledger of August 1 describes their visits here and a few of their reactions.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent to have the article entitled "Visiting British Student Likes To Bounce Around" inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITING BRITISH STUDENT LIKES TO BOUNCE AROUND

When a British engineering student comes to America for a visit, what appeals to him the most?

For one such student, now staying in Westfield—David Wilkinson of Leeds University—skyscrapers and cyclotrons are fine but you can't bounce on them. His answer to the above question, after a week in New Jersey:

"The most exciting time I've had here so far is jumping on the trampolines. We don't have them in England."

David is the guest of Mr. and Mrs. Irvin Bales of 760 Scotch Plains Avenue, Westfield. With five others from Britain, four men and a woman, who are spending a month in Westfield, he is getting a taste of American life under the Experiment in International Living.

The visitors will stay in Westfield until August 17, then go to Washington before returning to England.

Miss Joan King, a clerical officer of the Nottingham Education Committee, is staying at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Evans of 408 Salter Place.

Intrigued by the differences between the English and American educational systems, Miss King has already launched her own study of the local schools.

Alan Cresswell, a student at the College of Technology in Chesterfield, was curious about the huge bowling establishments that dot the Jersey countryside. His hosts, Westfield Councilman and Mrs. James Kefalontis of 8 Tamaques Way, took him to one to show him what it was like.

Cresswell was caught up in the spirit of the bowling fans, and decided to try a few games. He had never bowled before in his life, but scored over 200 to beat Mr. and Mrs. Kefalontis.

Brian Keefe, a schoolmaster staying with Mr. and Mrs. George Davidson of 520 Millcrest Avenue, said America and England have much in common.

"America seems just like another home," he commented.

Other visitors are James Elliott of Swansea College in Wales, living with Mr. and Mrs. John Centa of 415 Lincoln Avenue, and Bakar Gokal, Pakistan economics student, staying with Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bristol of 21 Carol Road.

The Cattle Brand—Identification—Inspection Program in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the cattle industry has historically been by far the largest agricultural activity in the State of Texas. Cattle stealing, or rustling, has always been one of the greatest problems. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association was organized at Graham, Tex., almost 90 years ago for the primary purpose of eliminating cattle stealing. It is today the largest livestock association in the United States and its primary activity remains the abolishing of cattle rustling.

Actually, there is more cattle stealing today than at any time in history. It is probably due in large part to the development of modern transportation which enables a cow thief to load stolen animals into a truck at night and sell them in any one of a hundred different markets tomorrow. The need for a coordinated system of cattle identification was never as great as it is today.

Historically, branding has provided the best and most practical means of identification, but branding is not now and never has been a universal practice, nor is it the exclusive method of identification. Obviously, natural breed, size, age, coloring, and so forth, provides effective identification, but it is not as readily described as brand identification.

About 1942 Congress passed legislation which empowered the Department of Agriculture to authorize local agencies to conduct brand inspection within their areas. In many States there is an official or State program of brand inspection. In Texas this program is conducted by the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, and it in-

volves the identification of cattle by all practical means, not simply by a record of brands alone. For a number of years this inspection was confined very largely to the larger terminal markets. With the extension of Federal control to all auction rings, this service was extended to possibly 200 markets in Texas and some in more distant points. The association provides inspectors, pays their salaries, and maintains a general clearinghouse at Fort Worth, where records of all animals brought on to a posted market are kept, as well as reports of all stolen cattle. The reports of sale go into the Fort Worth market every night. Of course, reports of theft are made as rapidly as they are discovered. Here, within the limits of information available, the association conducts a kind of fingerprint identification. Such identification cannot be conducted by any other existing agency because there is no such agency presently in existence which has the organization or facilities for this activity. This checking of sales has resulted in the apprehension of hundreds of cases of cattle stealing.

Apparently, there was no objection to the work of the association until the large number of auction rings were brought under its jurisdiction in 1957. At that time 13 rings joined in protest. Two of the operators have formally withdrawn their protest in the meantime and no one knows if many of the remaining 11 are actually interested in conducting this protest. It is, however, that that the protest and the only protest to the activities of the Association was filed by the operators of auction rings, not by livestock producers.

If the legislation was passed for the benefit of livestock producers, as the Congress apparently assumed it was, it seems that the Department would want to determine the degree of producer acceptance of the present practice. On the other hand, if the legislation is to be interpreted as having been passed for the benefit of auction rings, then it would seem that the number of auction rings favoring the program is many times greater than those opposing it. In the above-mentioned protest those auction rings opposing the program indicated that their opposition was based on, first, the fact that the association makes a charge of 8 cents per head for each animal on which they file a report. This is indeed a fact, but apparently no one contends that the 8 cents is excessive. On the contrary, it is apparently the smallest charge made in any State for this purpose. It is also contended that in some cases the inspector did not actually inspect the animals for which the charge was made. The association has agreed that this situation should be corrected and that in the future no charges will be made for animals not physically inspected.

The protesting auction rings in their complaint also argued that in many parts of Texas branding was not common practice. Admittedly, it is not a universal practice in any part of Texas. Admittedly, it may not be conducted by a majority of producers in certain parts of Texas, but certainly branding is used

by a representative number of cattlemen in every part of Texas. In discussing the prevalence of branding, however, the auction operators ignore the fact that this inspection program is indeed an inspection of all identifying marks, not simply a brand inspection program. Much of the confusion in regard to this program seems to stem from a misunderstanding of this point.

The United States Must Wake Up to the Marxist Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I should like to include a news article covering a speech made to the Rotary Club in Harriman, Tenn., by one of my esteemed constituents, Mr. Theodore F. Wagner, an engineer who lives in Kingston, Tenn.

In his address, he warned members that the "United States must wake up to Marxist threat."

The report of this speech which appeared in the Harriman, Tenn., Record, on Thursday, August 24, follows:

"Communism is a reality. We can't hide from that fact without dire consequences."

And—

"America is in grave danger of being taken over by communism."

"What can stop it? The American people, who must shake off their complacency and wake up."

These warnings were sounded before Harriman Rotary Club last Thursday noon by Theodore F. Wagner, Oak Ridge engineer, of 707 Sunset Drive, Kingston.

Speaking on facts and impressions he obtained at a national civil defense meeting in Colorado, Mr. Wagner told the club that international communism is audacious, vicious, greedy, inhuman, and that its purpose is to overthrow the world.

Communism, he pointed out, has announced openly that its plan is to take over the United States.

"Are we worried?" he asked. "Are the American people worried about this boast and threat?" He answered: "I don't think so. Most Americans keep thinking it can't happen here. But it can happen."

Pointing out that between 1917 and 1960—in just 43 years—communism has spread over one-third of the world, that between 1946 and 1950 70 square miles and 13,000 people an hour went behind the Iron Curtain, the speaker told the club members that it is time for Americans to wake up to facts.

Mr. Wagner, in his talk, urged a five-point program for the United States to combat communism:

1. Pursue a policy of coexistence, not just coexistence.
2. Pursue a policy of education. Teach our children about communism. Teach our people about communism, so they will know what they are up against.
3. Maintain our superior military might.
4. Use economics and world trade more actively to achieve our aim to stop the spread

of communism. Don't feed a sluggish communistic economy in a satellite country. Let Iron Curtain economic pressure discredit communism and create demands for freedom.

5. Take the political initiative at the United Nations and at regional and summit conference. Get off the defensive.

WORK BY PLAN

He quoted the British statesman, Edmund Burke, who said, "The only thing to insure the success of evil is for good men to do nothing."

"International communism is working according to a plan. It has even published that plan, with a schedule of takeovers," he said.

At first it spread out from Russia, taking over adjacent countries. But now—and this is a new feature added by Khrushchev—it is leaping over the world, jumping over one country to get to another.

Mr. Wagner, who is a graduate of both the University of Tennessee and the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, quoted what Nikolai Lenin, the Communist theorist, said in 1930:

"First we will take eastern Europe. Then the masses of Asia. Then we will encircle the United States of America which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack it. It will fall like an over-ripe fruit into our hands."

He also quoted Nikita Khrushchev in January 1959, while visiting in the United States, Khrushchev then said: "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you * * *"

Mr. Wagner told the Rotarians that Americans cannot ignore such boasts. Nor can America survive if its people are complacent in face of such threats.

One of the most effective means the Communists have used, Mr. Wagner said, has been international trade.

"Khrushchev has said that trade is not for profit but for power," he pointed out. "The Communists use trade to drive a wedge between free world trading partners. The Communists then take over sources of material of which a certain country is short of supply. Thus, they force that country to become dependent upon Russia."

Mr. Wagner pointed out that the United States has been active, too, our principal means being at the United Nations, keeping them talking while we maintained our strength. We have also used international aid, including the Economic Cooperative Administration, the Mutual Security Agency, the Foreign Operations Administration, and the International Cooperation Administration, on the theory that the strength of the United States is dependent on other free nations.

Although there has been some graft, losses and mismanagement in this foreign aid, 67 percent of it so far has been in military assistance, he said, and no nation to which we have given military aid has ever gone over to Russia.

"Force is the only thing the Communists recognize," he said.

Pointing out that the free world today has 200 divisions, of which only 17 are those of the United States, and 30,000 planes, 2,500 naval vessels. Mr. Wagner said he felt American military assistance has been well spent. He pointed out that little South Korea—the size of Indiana—has 22 divisions against the 17 of the United States.

"While Russia may be ahead of us in a few areas, the free world is ahead in the overall military picture," he said.

"We need, however, to do more," he said. "We need to combat Russia's propaganda more. We need to let the people of other nations know more what we do, and to combat more effectively the lies put out by Russia."

Mr. Wagner pointed out that "communism is the master of the big lie, of deceit, and of propaganda."

Russia claims it has increased its industrial production 100 percent. But from what base? The Communists don't say. If you start from nothing it is easy to increase production 100 percent.

When we negotiate a treaty for trade with a country, we give it little publicity. Russia gives it tremendous publicity in Pravda and in newspapers in the country affected. Russia will give a country in trade or in aid—not what the people of that country need—but what will benefit Russia the most.

WE'D HAVE TO CUT

"I think these statistics are interesting, about how much Russia has gained industrially," he said. "In order to enjoy all the glories of the present Soviet system, we in the United States would have to abandon three-fifths of our steel capacity, two-thirds of our petroleum capacity, 95 percent of our electric power output, destroy two of every three of our hydroelectric plants, and get along on a tenth of our present volume of natural gas.

"We would have to rip up 14 of every 15 miles of our mainline railway tracks. We would have to sink 8 of every 9 of our oceangoing ships, scrap 19 of every 20 of our cars and trucks, and shrink our civilian air fleet to a shadow of its present size.

"We would have to cut our living standard by three-fourths, destroy 40 million television sets, and 9 of every 10 telephones, and 7 of every 10 houses, and then we would have to put about 60 million of our people back on the farm.

"If we did all this, we would have the glories of communism which Russia has now."

A Bill To Deal With Problems Arising by Reason of Communist Propaganda Originating Abroad and Distributed in the United States by First-Class Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I introduced a bill which is designed to deal with certain aspects of the rather complex problems arising by reason of the influx of millions of pieces of Communist propaganda which have their origin abroad and are now disseminated in great part by first-class mail within the United States. This bill is proposed to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the Postmaster General in certain cases to give notice to the addressee of the use of the mail for the dissemination of Communist propaganda.

Within recent months we have observed an acceleration of the Communist brainwashing effort directed at the free world and particularly to residents of the United States. This increased tempo of Communist propaganda activity, I believe, bears a close relation to the rising temperature of the international situation, which in turn is a consequence of the growing power and arrogance of the Communist bloc. Communist propaganda items from abroad transmitted through the U.S. postal service have increased in the year 1960 to an

astounding 137 percent over the year 1959, whereas the increase in the year 1959 over the year 1958 was only 18 percent. During the year 1959, the U.S. Customs Service processed over 6 million packages of Communist propaganda, containing over 10 million items of printed matter. In 1960, over 14 million packages were processed, containing in excess of 21 million items, such as newspapers, magazines, books, pictures, and posters. During the 2 months of February and March 1961, over 162,000 packages of magazines and 11,000 packages of newspapers were addressed to the United States from Communist Cuba, which is now the base of Communist operations in this hemisphere. The extraordinary Communist effort in the field of propaganda is further attested by a report of the U.S. Office of Education indicating that in 1959 the Soviet Union published over 30 million books, containing 830 titles, in 26 foreign languages, for dissemination to non-Communist countries and which were either distributed free or sold far below cost mainly to Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

In the above figures of packages of Communist propaganda entering the United States, I did not include in that number the millions of pieces of first-class mail, containing Communist propaganda, also received from abroad. Such mail is not opened for inspection, and presents certain obvious problems. It is significant that the Communist conspiracy is now extensively utilizing first-class mailing privileges as a means for disseminating their poison and fiction. I have received reports and complaints from all areas of the United States. Many people have become annoyed, and some confused, and others alarmed. A good bit of this mail is addressed to foreign language groups, who sense the possibility of blackmail or harm. The extent of the effort clearly attests the importance with which the Communists regard this propaganda campaign. George V. Allen, formerly Director of the U.S. Information Agency, previously estimated that the amount expended by the Communists in the year 1957 for propaganda in the non-Communist world was between \$500 to \$750 million. Present estimates of the amount being expended in this field indicates that the amount may well exceed \$2 billion.

How does one cope with this propaganda? Does one collect and destroy such items of propaganda piece by piece? Is this presently practicable, or even desirable? Curiously, Lenin long ago pointed up the absurdity of such an effort. In his notorious theoretical document, "What's To Be Done," Lenin laid down the basic doctrine for the conduct of Communist propaganda, and agitational activities. While stressing the importance of the distribution of "illegal literature" by his band of secret Communist revolutionaries, he amused himself by pointing out the difficulties which the opponents of communism would find in coping with it. He said, "the police will soon come to realize the folly and futility of setting the whole judicial and administrative machine into

motion to intercept every copy of a publication that is being broadcast in thousands."

Now I would point out that the success of such "illegal literature" depends upon the people to whom it is addressed. Lenin must have assumed the existence of an unsophisticated audience. That will not be the case in the United States. The antidote for the poison of Communist propaganda is knowledge and truth. I have no real fear that this absurd Communist propaganda will seduce any appreciable segment of our people, or lead them from the path of reason and loyalty—if our people are adequately informed as to its nature, origin, and character.

In the Internal Security Act of 1950 (title I, cited as the Subversive Activities Control Act) we there had to deal with the problems involved in the dissemination of Communist propaganda within the United States by Communist-action and front groups. Under section 10, these problems were met in part simply by requiring Communist organizations, against whom a final order to register is in effect, to label all publications transmitted in the mail as being disseminated by a Communist organization, and to announce that sponsorship of any radio or television broadcast conducted by them. We there felt that if our people were informed of the nature, origin, and contents of such propaganda activity, they would be able to judge and deal with it. The bill which I have introduced yesterday, in fact and in effect, supplements section 10 of the Internal Security Act. While section 10 requires the labeling of Communist propaganda disseminated by internal Communist organizations, the bill I introduced extends the disclosure process to publications transmitted by mail from without the United States to persons resident here.

Moreover, I believe that it is important to strengthen the democratic process, which I believe is the natural effect and result of this type of disclosure and information statute. If our people are informed of the nature and techniques of Communist propaganda—and this is a responsibility of the educational process and the free press—we shall not need fear that our people will become infected. Knowledge is the most effective immunization against the propaganda virus. I believe that when all our people understand the degraded and corrupt tactics of Marxism-Leninism, the Communists will find their propaganda effort to be waste of money and paper. They will not undermine our society. They shall only destroy themselves.

The Strategic Food Reserve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the increasingly tense world situation, un-

derscored by the possibility that the Berlin crisis could trigger nuclear war, has brought thinking citizens more and more to a realization that much of our civil defense planning is dangerously outmoded.

Leaders of industry and science are increasingly becoming aware that it is not enough to think only in terms of deterrent weapons and purely military strength, necessary as they are, to counter an enemy blow which could wipe out millions of our people and subject many millions more to the ravages of disease and hunger.

I have long believed that one of our major weak spots has been lack of adequate civil defense planning to assure that we can feed survivors of an atomic attack. It is for this reason that I have supported the creation of a reserve of storable commodities strategically located throughout the Nation against the terrible day when it will be vitally needed to insure that we can survive and recover from an enemy attack.

A leader in the renewed drive to bring orderly, comprehensive planning and action into this key area of national defense, Mr. Edmund F. Buryan, president of Motec Industries, Inc., Minneapolis and Hopkins, Minn., showed an acute awareness of the problem and its solution when he stated to the 1961 Farm Forum in Minneapolis:

In past wars, we needed merely to ask the farmer to increase his acreage and the food was grown. But after nuclear attack our land could become a wasteland for a time. Providing a strategic reserve of food could allow us to survive and also serve as a deterrent to enemy attack.

Mr. Buryan, a business executive of long experience in U.S. and world markets, struck a very significant theme, I believe, when he suggested the creation of a strategic food reserve and urged that we take a new look at our "so-called agricultural surpluses." These "surpluses," as Mr. Buryan pointed out, are not surpluses at all but a very basic weapon in our nuclear age defense arsenal. Contrary to the popular impression of huge and wasting farm surpluses, there may actually be underproduction in terms of the Nation's survival needs.

Mr. Buryan's remarks to the 1961 Farm Forum are thought-provoking inquiries into a challenge to which we have not yet fully faced up. In order to bring this important analysis of a very basic problem to the attention of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Buryan's statement, as printed in the September 1, 1961, issue of a leading business publication, *Implement & Tractor* magazine, be printed as a part of my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEED A STRATEGIC FOOD RESERVE
(By E. F. Buryan, president, Motec Industries, Inc.)

Recently a newspaperman asked me my thoughts on the farm surplus problem. I tossed the question back by requesting that he give me a definition of the term "surplus," for nowhere in the press do we see references to the petroleum surplus problem or the molybdenum surplus problem. In general,

such stocks are referred to as "strategic reserves."

The solution to the farm problem demands an examination of the surplus situation—for there never has been a proper definition of the term "surplus." Before the Nation can determine what a surplus is, it must first determine what the strategic reserve should be—along the same lines as determination of strategic reserves of oil, tin, molybdenum, and other essentials. Once such a strategic reserve requirement can be determined, then stocks above that figure might be considered surplus.

It is interesting and at the same time very sobering to discover that in planning for the possibility of attack upon our country or other national emergency, that the stockpile report to Congress lists 76 materials which are classified as "group 1 of the list of strategic and critical materials for stockpiling."

It is reassuring to note that the Federal Government has stockpiled these critical materials, and that there are 26 million tons of such materials valued at \$6 billion.

These materials, to name only a few, include items from aluminum to zinc, and include certain agriculturally based products such as opium, castor oil, and feathers. But not one reference to food.

I am shocked, however, not to find a strategic and critical stockpile of food in the "Stockpile Report to the Congress," even of June 1960.

There is, of course, another "annex 31" to the civil defense national plan which is entitled "The National Food Plan." This booklet says that "the food industry, including farm producers and those industries supplying requisites to them, are responsible, in cooperation with appropriate Government agencies, for planning and executing measures designed in accordance with the plan to assure a continuing supply of food to the Nation."

Annex 31 says that as regards the public: "Individuals and families are responsible for maintaining personal stocks of food in their homes or shelters; sufficient to meet their needs until other supplies are available. These stocks should be sufficient for at least 2 weeks following attack."

What kind of strategic reserve of food and fiber does this provide? Hadn't we better get busy right away and lay plans for a realistic stockpile of strategic cotton and corn, soybeans and sugar and other farm products supposedly "in surplus"?

Let's look at some figures of production and consumption of a few major crops.

Our total annual sugar supplies are a little over 11 million tons. We use a little more than 9 million tons. In the event of disaster, the balance of 2 million tons would last us a little more than 2 months. Is that sufficient?

Our supplies of oats are about 1.4 billion bushels. We use over a billion bushels each year. Our balance is about 270 million bushels.

In case of emergency, this balance would last us a little more than 2 months. Can you call that surplus?

In the case of milk, we have a production of 124.4 billion pounds a year. We use all of this each year, and only 4 percent of the supply is canned or condensed.

Our total cotton supplies amount to 23.5 million bales, and we use 16 million bales each year. This leaves us about a 6-month supply of cotton. If we canceled all our exports, we would have a little more than 18 months' supply of cotton for our use, but I do not think we would deny our allies food and fiber in the event of a general attack.

Our supplies of corn are approximately 5.9 billion bushels. We use up a little more than 4 billion bushels, of which 3.5 billion is for livestock feed. This leaves a balance of close to 2 billion bushels, about a 6-month supply. That could be classified as a strategic reserve.

The situation in wheat is, however, of a different dimension. Our carryover for the 1959 year was 1.3 billion bushels. We harvested over 1.1 billion bushels and imported 7 million bushels, for total supplies of about 2.5 billion bushels of wheat. We used something over a billion bushels, including exports of a half a billion bushels. Our total usage, then, was about 1.1 billion bushels.

If we exclude the export of a half-billion bushels, our total domestic usage would be on the order of 600 million bushels. Placed against our supplies of 2½ billion bushels, this would mean a reserve of about 4 years' wheat.

If we include export wheat in our usage we still have a balance of a year's supply.

Since we have not established the amount of strategic reserve of food that the American people would require in the event of a disaster, our so-called surplus is still open to question as "surplus." Perhaps we need all of it as a strategic reserve.

Up to this point we have been talking about food in the rough—wheat, corn and oats. But we also need in our strategic reserve tremendous quantities of food in more readily available forms—canned pork and gravy, perhaps, such as is now being purchased in millions of pounds for people in depressed areas, or the packaged rations used by our Armed Forces.

And we need this food strategically located in the perimeter areas of large centers of population.

In past wars, we needed merely to ask the farmer to increase his acreage and the food was grown. After any nuclear attack, though man may escape an attack, our bountiful land may become, in fact, a waste land.

Is it, then, anything less than simple caution to provide a strategic reserve of grain and fiber and milk and meat properly stored?

Has any administration given proper consideration to how far ahead of Russia we are in what should be strategic reserves of food? Until that has been done, I for one cannot go along with proposals for cutting back acreage.

Let us never forget that we are faced with a threat—not merely to our cities and our farms and our industry—but to our very existence.

We can rebuild structures of stone and wood. We can fabricate new machine tools and erect factories. But the ultimate winner in any conflict will be the population that survives—and it must eat to survive.

Children Handicapped by Deafness

SPEECH
OF

HON. PETER A. GARLAND

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Members of the House for their favorable action yesterday on H.R. 9011. My interest has been so deep for this particular cause that I have submitted my own bill, H.R. 5623, for the training of special teachers for children handicapped by speech and/or hearing impairments.

From the research I have done on the current ability of our schools and communities to properly care for and train these children, it is obvious that there are serious shortages that prevent the proper training of these young people

who could be more useful to themselves and their communities if they received the special instruction they require.

I am anxious for this shortage of specially trained teachers of the deaf, pathologists, and audiologists to be corrected and augmented by a Federal program of assistance. The program I have proposed will be of the grant-in-aid variety and would be administered by the Commissioner of Education in coordination with accredited training institutions. Since the encouragement of these specially trained teachers cannot be fostered at the local level, it is imperative that the Government take steps to help, not by gifts, but by assistance that will be matched by participating training institutions.

This problem is not theoretical. Its severity cannot be ignored. The situation is revealed in the experience over the years. In the past, it has been necessary for schools such as the Governor Baxter State School for the Deaf, in Portland, Maine, to obtain retired teachers, to get extensions for older teachers as they come to the normal retirement age, and to get teachers from the public school system who do not have this very vital specialized training.

It is obvious that this is detrimental to our handicapped children who are so deserving of this help.

Other programs have been tried, such as scholarships, but even this has not been sufficient to maintain the necessary staff members qualified for this work.

It is my belief that recruitment must come on a national level to fulfill these teaching needs. Schools for the deaf are under a tremendous pressure to obtain these specialized teachers because of our expanding population. Federal assistance for training these people is desperately needed.

The key to this problem is simply that there are not enough trained teachers to deal with speech and hearing impairments. The public school systems cannot handle the problems and needs of these handicapped children, and the local communities cannot or will not supply the funds to attract the number of teachers required.

This bill provides our handicapped children with the opportunity to help themselves to become more useful and valuable citizens because this legislation assists in providing them with a proper education under the guidance of expert instructors.

These children are depending upon us to help them. I am proud that we have not let them down.

Remaking the Constitution?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Con-

stantine Brown, entitled "Remaking the Constitution?" This article appeared in the September 11, 1961, issue of the Evening Star and provides much food for thought.

It may be difficult for some of us to understand, but there are many in the world today who seriously question the practicality of adherence to the basic truths which most of us have considered the very cornerstone of our form of government and our religion.

The article follows:

REMAKING THE CONSTITUTION?—BELIEF THAT IT SHOULD BE MADE EASIER FOR PEOPLE TO BE LED IS QUESTIONED

(By Constantine Brown)

ROME, ITALY.—Working abroad affords a reporter more time to read and reflect than when he is in the maelstrom of Washington's political turmoil. And a small news item sent by a friend or reader can provide food for such reflection.

Once upon a time—not long ago—fundamental, basic truths were considered the foundations upon which were built our laws, the dogmas of our churches, and our code of ethics. But recently a clique of social scientists has convinced a number of intellectuals and politicians that basic truths are "absolutes" which should be viewed with an open and inquiring mind. And, it is contended, "absolutes," such as the Ten Commandments, belief that God is truth, and the moral standards accepted over many generations, hamper our thinking apparatus.

It is no wonder then that our Constitution has fallen into the category of an "absolute," which, it is said, is hampering the President in both foreign and domestic affairs. To us who have spent a lifetime of trying, as well as we could, to live by the Ten Commandments, to fear God (that's just the trouble with God, say the new theorists; God breeds unnecessary fear) and firmly believe in the Constitution and the greatness of our Nation, it comes somewhat as a shock that our Constitution is now up for reappraisal, reexamination and possible fundamental revisions.

The first trial balloon went up on June 9, 1960. It was released by Dr. Brock Chisholm, former chief of U.N.'s WHO, and until recently president of the World Federation of Mental Health and vice president of the World Association of World Federalists. He was addressing a session honoring World Mental Health Year at Atlantic City when he sent up this balloon which apparently attracted little attention in America.

According to a small news item in the Washington Evening Star, this internationally known psychiatrist is reported to have said, "Dependence on the obsolete Constitution of the United States is a form of magic Americans must give up to survive in the nuclear age." This item goes on to say that "the United States is hamstrung by the almost 200-year-old document in the conduct of foreign affairs . . . the Constitution is regarded as a sacred book, he noted. 'To criticize it is like saying to a Fundamental Baptist that the Bible is out of date.' . . . Dr. Chisholm explained he doesn't think the Constitution should be scrapped but it certainly should be amended."

The only ripple this news item caused at the time was one feeble letter of protest to the editor of the Star.

But the idea, propounded by this Canadian did not die; its roots grew while we slept. A reader in California was kind enough to send to your reporter in Rome some clippings from the San Francisco Chronicle, News-Call Bulletin, Palo Alto Times, and the Examiner of July 28 and 29 which reported a televised speech of Senator Fulbright before the Cubberly education conference at Stanford University. As one item

began, "Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, today urged Americans to face the possibility that basic changes in our constitutional system may be needed to meet the needs of the 20th century . . . The President is 'hobbled in his task of leading the American people to consensus and concerted action by the restrictions of power imposed on him by a constitutional system designed for an 18th century agrarian society far removed from the centers of world power, he said.'"

Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has apparently been convinced that the American public, besides going to the polling machines, is no longer capable of conducting its own affairs. The reports quoted him as saying that strong Presidential power is needed, for only the President can rise above parochialism and private measures and hope to overcome the excess and inadequacies of public opinion.

Another California paper reported him as saying that both the constitutional reforms and the relinquishment of sovereignty are necessary if the United States is to win in its competition with Russia. Public opinion must be educated and led, he is quoted as saying.

Senator FULBRIGHT might be able to convince some Americans that this is so, but he is sadly lacking in understanding of our European allies when he is reported to have said that "The North Atlantic nations, with their common values as well as enemies, must surrender far more of their jealously guarded sovereignty than they have already done and press forward with the development of supernational institutions."

Nowhere will he find a stronger sentiment for nationalism and sovereignty than among the NATO nations. It is a mistake to believe that they abandoned one iota of their sovereignty when they joined either the military-political NATO alliance or their political-economic Common Market. Cooperation with other nations with like interests does not mean that they are one-worldists. Quite the contrary.

Somehow or other, American public opinion, despite its it-can't-happen-here attitude, has suddenly awakened to the many inroads our enemy has made in our Nation. And this awakening seems to have pushed the panic button among some policymakers in Washington. One Capital reporter recently wrote, citing the alarm in official circles, "Americans are increasingly in a to-heck-with-prudence mood." He goes on to write that the proportion of people who think this is sizable, "and it has certain important perils for President Kennedy."

This item draws attention back to Senator FULBRIGHT's Stanford University speech. Is it considered by some of the new ideologists who want to remake America from the Constitution up, that since public opinion refuses to follow the line of appeasement toward Soviet Russia and international communism and is hewing more to old-fashioned patriotic beliefs, the Constitution must be amended so that the President will have the power to educate and lead the people as propounded by Senator FULBRIGHT.

Tribute to Senator Aiken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, recently the Barre-Montpelier, Vt., Times-

Argus published an article by Dr. Albert Norman which is a tribute to my distinguished senior colleague.

This tribute brings to focus the many fine qualities which he possesses and the pride which Vermont takes in her senior Senator.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIKEN: VERMONT'S PROFILE OF COURAGE

(By Dr. Albert Norman)

Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.—Isaiah 1: 17.

I like to think of GEORGE D. AIKEN, U.S. Senator from Vermont, as New England's George Norris.

Yet I never met the Senator but once. I met the Senator about a year or two or so ago in Montpelier quite by chance, while waiting in the office of a physician of high repute. I can recall nothing special that we talked about. It could have been the weather; it could not have been women, for I am too old and the Senator too honorable.

I was impressed, however: the stocky figure; the large, bold features; the luster in the steel-blue eyes; the bounteous mind; the serious but kindly mien.

For much longer still have I admired the Senator's politics: in scope imposing, in my opinion; impressive for strength and accumulated momentum; large by comparison with other, typical, men of politics; of a quality of heart, it seems to me, that always has enabled men—and ennobled them—to face the moral risks of life with moral valor.

I gain the impression that in her senior Senator Vermont prides herself. And the Nation is not ashamed.

SPEAKS FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

Not sumptuous, Vermont is, in the main, an agricultural society. No one need apologize, for she is moderate in temper and pursuit. Her old, yet viable tradition—elsewhere, unfortunately, under attack—gives the State a sounder social stability and her internal politics, even at its worst, a lighter hue; not perfect harmony—heaven forbid—just less of that severity and passion that is to be found where more extreme points of view and interest compete for power. Vermont's agricultural interest has much of the 19th century's Populist tradition in it: "free soil," common man's tradition—the tradition of social justice.

Senator AIKEN, I believe, is its spokesman.

Merely by way of illustration: as recently as last month he led in a Senate contest against jeopardizing the right of farmers to act together effectively through their co-operatives in purchasing and marketing their products. It does not require a ton of brains to get the meaning of this, to find out on which side of the fence the Senator stood up to be counted. In 1956 he argued on the Senate floor against high rigid price supports, which would, he said, make the farmers less prosperous. Furthermore, unless the farmer took matters into his own hands and stopped relying on Government officials to work out his salvation he will never get his full share of the national income. He blamed rigid price supports for the decline of the dairy farmer's lot, because the reduced available supply has led to the use of dairy substitutes. Flexible supports, the Senator contended, would increase the consumption of milk, for example.

HE SPEAKS FOR VERMONT

And so he spoke for Vermont—for the main body of her people. And so he spoke on other issues as well.

Without going into the merits of public versus private electric power—there is much to be said for both sides under given conditions—Senator AIKEN, if I am not mistaken, champions the cause of Norris, the great Nebraska Republican, father of TVA. Where the choice is clearly between rigid proprietary-managerial control-ownership and the broader body politic, our senior Senator would, I feel, choose the latter, whereas someone else might not.

Although it would be grossly impertinent of anyone to belabel our Senator, I would not hesitate a moment to express my conviction that he is a liberal Republican or, to put it differently, a liberal conservative or a conservative of liberal, or broad rather than narrow views and feelings.

CONCERN FOR MANKIND

A deep and abiding concern for humanity is clearly discernible in much of what Senator AIKEN says and does. Humanitarianism, the long lost sentiment, survives and thrives in him as it does among the great body of folk, luckily untouched by the coarse strands of modern positivist philosophy. In a solution of both national and international problems humanitarianism cannot be ruled out, until war is forced upon us as an arbiter. Even then, the laws of humanity apply. Internationally, Senator AIKEN said in 1957, our policy should be dedicated to the search for a formula for lasting peace without sacrificing the requirements of our growing defense needs.

Despite its largely agricultural complexion, Vermont is slowly moving toward a more complex society resulting from industrialism. However much desirable it may be, industrialism is bound to be accompanied by the problems that have plagued every industrial society since the industrial revolution first came to England, unless social statesmanship like that of Victorian England and progressive-Republican (Theodore Roosevelt) and liberal-Democratic (Wilson - F. D. Roosevelt - Truman - Kennedy) America succeeds in preventing an extreme concentration of power on either side of the industrial scale.

EARTHLY ANGELS ARE FEW

In line with his interest in the people on the lower rungs of life, our senior Senator recently supported an extension, rather than limitation, of minimum wages.

No man is faultless. Few women, I am told, are impeccable. There are, in other words, no angels this side of heaven.

So that whatever our revered Senator's faults and whatever his vote on certain issues, there is no question in my own mind, though in fairness to others there might legitimately be in theirs, that he speaks the majority conscience of Vermont.

Without men of moral courage and of generous and noble heart, this State, this Nation—indeed the world—would be, as the prophet Isaiah says (Isaiah 1: 30), "as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water."

Give on Berlin Sure—What To Give Is Thorn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article by Chalmers M. Roberts, which appeared in the September 10

issue of the Washington Post, and which is entitled "Give on Berlin Sure: What To Give Is Thorn," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE ON BERLIN SURE—WHAT TO GIVE IS THORN

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

The apparent stepping up of Nikita Khrushchev's fall crisis timetable has had a jolting effect in Washington. But once the Berlin border was physically sealed and the nuclear test ban moratorium was junked, the focus of American policy discussion returned to where it long has been: how to find an answer to Khrushchev's relentless demands for a new status for beleaguered West Berlin, including access to and from the city.

It is worth surveying the problem in some of its larger aspects now that the tempo of crisis has been increased and as two neutralist leaders are about to arrive here to plead with President Kennedy that he be "reasonable" in the face of Khrushchev's seeming intransigence.

THE FISHING IS POOR

American tactics up to now can be divided into two parts. First, since the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting at Vienna in June, efforts have been made to convince the Soviet Union that Mr. Kennedy not only has the weapons but the will to use them against Russia if it comes to war. This effort has taken the form of warning words and publicized actions in beefing up American military power, especially nonnuclear capabilities.

Second. American officials have sought to discover Khrushchev's minimal demands. This is the objective of Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson's current inquiries in Moscow. It will be Secretary of State Dean Rusk's objective when, he hopes, he talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at the United Nations next week.

So far, however, diplomatic probings have been close to fruitless and the old hands in dealing with Moscow would be amazed if Gromyko told Rusk the time of day. More likely, the gloomier diplomats figure, not until a Kennedy-Khrushchev summit meeting later this year will the Soviet hand be discernible.

Moscow's way of doing business is to put up a stiff front, take a self-righteous pose and then drop some hints in odd places to indicate its real bargaining position. So far there have been few of the latter.

A QUESTIONABLE FEELER

One hint was picked up in West Berlin a week ago by the New York Herald Tribune's Gaston Coblenz. He reported a private Soviet suggestion that some form of international air traffic organization could serve as an intermediary between the Western powers and East Germany in a new agreement on Western air passage across that puppet state.

As Coblenz said, this could be a way of sugar coating future East German sovereignty over the air routes. But such hints are often repudiated by the Soviet Union. They form only a tantalizing clue to what in the end turns out to be Moscow's real position.

Incidentally, President Kennedy has said that "no summit between East and West is useful unless the groundwork has been laid beforehand which will insure some success." Former President Eisenhower said much the same thing. But it now seems probable that Mr. Kennedy, like General Eisenhower before him, will nonetheless go to a summit without any substantial prior groundwork and without any real indications of success.

JUST SHORT OF WAR

The many months of cogitation here on the Berlin problem have by now produced some major themes. First of all, there is general agreement that Khrushchev wants an agreement without having a war but that he is willing to go to the brink to get it. While there is some talk that Khrushchev is acting from internal Communist bloc weakness as well as from nuclear weapons strength, the predominant view is that he believes the balance of power has so shifted in his favor that now is the time to claim some major fruits from it.

Given this assumption, it follows that some new East-West arrangement is inevitable. What, then, to seek?

American officials say privately that they can see some advantages in a settlement which would clarify the status of Berlin and of Western access to it. Despite the loud public claims of Western access rights, not all of these rights are clearly documented.

The record is indeed so fuzzy that the Soviets have been able to destroy their legal basis in many minds. In effect, certain rights exist more as a result of years of Soviet acquiescence than from any explicit Soviet words in formal documents.

It also is recognized here that many quarters, both inside and outside the West, see merit in the Soviet contention that World War II is long over and that the West should not try to stand indefinitely on its wartime occupation rights.

OLD HANDS RELUCTANT

Those diplomats and officials who have lived longest with the Berlin controversy are generally most loath to abandon these old positions. Some of the recently arrived New Frontiersmen are inclined to argue that here, indeed, is an opportunity to put West Berlin on a better longtime basis.

Events, however, are forcing the Kennedy administration to face up to a series of dilemmas involved in the Berlin issue.

The President and Rusk have made West Berlin a symbol of Western resistance to Communist encroachment. There have been many warnings against Soviet "salami" tactics, the practice of slicing away the Western position in West Berlin. In effect, the flag has been nailed so high on the West Berlin mast that any alteration in the city's status would seem to many the equivalent of a Western retreat.

The President is very aware of this. He feels that if the United States appeared to be caving in on Berlin, it would not be long before the neutrals began to make their own private arrangements with Moscow. Hence, assuming that some "give" will be required of the West to get a new Berlin status, the details of what is offered Khrushchev are of the utmost importance in Mr. Kennedy's mind.

That some "give" is inevitable, no one here doubts; it is the price of inherently exposed and therefore weak Western geographic posture in West Berlin.

The President and Rusk have stressed that the "heart of the matter," to use Rusk's phrase, is threefold: the right of Western military units to be in West Berlin; the freedom of both military and civilian access to and from West Berlin, and the viability of the city of West Berlin.

During the abortive 1959 East-West conference on Berlin, the Western nations offered to limit their troops, agreed not to introduce nuclear weapons and said they would curtail their propaganda and intelligence activities there. Now the Communists are hollering for an end to what they call Western espionage, sabotage and propaganda activities, including the silencing of RIAS (Radio in the American Sector), the lone voice of truth which can be heard in East Germany.

The Communists doubtless were encouraged to demand all this by Mr. Kennedy's

statement in his July 25 radio-TV speech of "our readiness to remove any actual irritants in West Berlin." To the Soviets, the list of "irritants" is all-inclusive.

In retrospect, some diplomats now are saying, it would have been wiser to have removed some of these "irritants" as a unilateral Western action during the period of relative East-West calm over Berlin earlier this year. But it was not done; the State Department never recommended it. Any changes in a new agreement with Moscow thus will be labeled "concessions" both by the President's political opponents at home and by Communist propagandists around the globe.

Finally, Rusk is determined to do what his predecessors failed to do: to keep secret until the bargaining table the Western "fall-back" positions; that is, the maximum the West is willing to concede to Moscow.

This secrecy so far seems to have been wrapped more around an absence of policy than around any hard and fast decisions on fall-back positions. But in the end, it will mean a certain sense of shock to the West if and when concessions are revealed.

But when all of this has been said, the question of specific policies remains. This the Big Four Western foreign ministers will have to tackle when they gather here Thursday. At least three major factors have been under intense discussion in Washington.

One is the problem of de facto recognition of East Germany. A major Khrushchev aim is to stabilize this shaky puppet regime; a big step in that direction was the closure of the Berlin border, which stopped the flow of refugees from that unhappy land.

But Khrushchev wants the West to recognize his puppet and he is using the Berlin issue as a lever to force it. He says that once he signs a peace treaty with East Germany, the Western Powers will have to deal with that regime if they want a new agreement on access to West Berlin.

The American face is flatly opposed to any formal (de jure) recognition of East Germany and Khrushchev appears to accept that. But more and more there is a willingness here to accept East Germany's existence as a fact and to deal with it whenever such diplomatic intercourse is necessary; that is, to grant de facto recognition. After all, it is argued by some, we deal de facto to some degree at least with Red China.

The core of the problem, however, is the effect of recognition on West Germany. For one of Khrushchev's aims is to have the West deal with East Germany as a symbol that there are now and for the indefinite future will be two German nations, East and West. To grant de jure recognition would be to accept Khrushchev's contention formally; to deal with East Germany de facto would be interpreted as close to the same thing.

American officials have been unable to come to grips with this problem with West German officials because of the elections there next Sunday. But once the voting is over, the issue will have to be faced. The question then will be whether the shock of the Berlin border closing plus Khrushchev's nuclear blackmail will bring West German acceptance of a new policy of dealing with East Germany.

Some way of sweetening such a concession, something akin to the rumored Soviet idea of working through an international air traffic organization, for example, might provide an answer.

West Germany today has considerable dealings with East Germany, including a trade agreement which includes the right of passage for West German civil traffic down the autobahn to West Berlin. But the psychological hump of direct American-East German negotiations would be something else again.

A second factor under discussion here is Khrushchev's longtime demand that the

West formally accept the Oder-Neisse line, provisionally set by the Allies and Russia in wartime, as the final border between East Germany and Poland. French President Charles de Gaulle already has publicly accepted it. But West Germany today includes millions who formerly lived in the old German lands east of that line and it has been considered political suicide for any West German politician to accept it as final.

In any East-West agreement, however, the line probably will be accepted. There is no disposition outside West Germany to make a great fight to leave the border issue open.

There are some reports, however, that in any East-West negotiations the West will bring up the Rumanian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian peace treaties and perhaps the post-war accords on Poland. The argument, it is said, would be that the West will no longer continue to wink at the Communist disregard of the obligations those agreements include, among them free elections.

This idea amounts, some believe, to an effort to swap the status quo in Eastern Europe, including acceptance of the Oder-Neisse line, for something akin to the status quo in West Berlin. The efficacy of this idea is, however, doubtful.

Finally, there is a search going on for ways and means of reaching some agreement on what is vaguely termed "European security." It long has been felt here that to negotiate only over West Berlin means only Western concessions; hence the negotiations should be broadened.

There have been several fruitless East-West exercises on the security theme, fruitless because the Soviet aim has been to have American troops pulled out of West Germany as part of a demilitarization scheme. American policy has accepted as valid West Germany's demand that it be treated as an equal partner within the NATO framework.

To agree to a special status for West Germany in some European security arrangement, the argument goes, would be to loosen that strong and virile nation's ties to the West.

But this sort of question cannot be resolved until the American Government and its allies resolve the fundamental issues, especially that of de facto recognition of East Germany and what it might entail.

Despite the many months of celebration here on the Berlin issue, President Kennedy has been unhappy about some of the staff work. He himself has delved into the remotest corners of the problem in a way his predecessor left to his Secretary of State and others. The best that can be said is that while Mr. Kennedy has not found the answer, he certainly has been trying. And he hasn't had any cooperation from Khrushchev.

As to the outlook ahead, it would be risky to say more than it is likely to be a very cold fall and winter with the world's vision obscured by a storm of Communist verbiage mixed with nuclear thunderbolts designed to weaken Western nerves. What the picture will be when the clouds lift is beyond conjecture.

Darien Group Sends Magazines and Books to Readers Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ABNER W. SIBAL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, one of the keys to peace between nations is mutual

understanding. This is not easy to obtain on a government-to-government level. Official exchanges between governments all too often obscure the true moods and feelings of the people those governments represent. Were these true feelings really known they would have to be recognized by the governments and reflected in official policies. Personal contact between citizens of different countries is undoubtedly the most effective way of reaching international understanding, but this is very difficult to do on a significant scale. Another way is through an exchange of literature which accurately portrays the moods and feelings of each country.

There is in my district, a dedicated group of volunteer women, organized as the Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., a nonprofit organization, which has sent thousands of American books and magazines overseas since its formation in 1949. I would like to take this opportunity to salute the work this organization is doing and to draw to it the attention of other Members of Congress in the hope that this approach may spread to many other parts of the country. In this connection, I submit for the RECORD a recent article on the Darien group, which appeared in the New York Times:

DARIEN GROUP SENDS MAGAZINES AND BOOKS TO READERS ABROAD

(By Richard H. Parke)

DARIEN, CONN., September 6.—From an abandoned firehouse on the Boston Post Roads here, thousands of books and magazines are being sent abroad to further international understanding.

The project is being carried on by nearly 100 Fairfield County women volunteers under the auspices of the Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., a nonprofit group founded in 1949. An old barn at the rear of the firehouse is being remodeled to provide additional space.

The books and magazines, all donated, are packed in 70-pound cartons and shipped to U.S. Information Agency centers for presentation to individuals, libraries, schools, and colleges.

In addition, the women fulfill personal requests for reading matter—some from residents of Communist countries. Not long ago a man in Hungary wrote that he had read about the "earthworm industry" in the United States.

"I would like some books on it," he said, adding wryly, "though I know if it is successful here, it, too, will become nationalized."

Mrs. John W. Barnes, president of the Book Plan, succeeded in finding two books on the subject for him.

A grateful Polish woman wrote in broken English in acknowledgement of a book she had requested.

"I wish American people easier to an understanding. Please forget me not. Blessings and goodbye."

A resident of Tanganyika, East Africa, said he had refused some books from Cairo, Egypt, because they contained "false doctrines."

"I believe in democracy and nothing else," he declared.

Wednesday and Thursday are workshop days at the former firehouse. Teams of women prepare the books and magazines for shipment, a task that begins with a careful sorting and ends when each magazine or book is stamped, "From Your Friend, Darien Book Aid Plan, Inc., Darien, Conn., USA."

Spiritual Life Spurs Wisconsin's Residents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years I have welcomed many opportunities to point with pride to outstanding features of my home State, Wisconsin—deep in the heart of America. Playing a significant role in the Nation's economic, social and political life, I believe my State has made an outstanding contribution to its progress.

Despite other major assets, however, our most important contribution continues to be our people—a strong, sturdy, forward-looking, ambitious people, guided by high ideas and strong spiritual faith. Recently, the Milwaukee Sentinel published a splendid special edition on progress in Wisconsin. Among the articles was included a special feature by James M. Johnston, entitled "Spiritual Life Spurs Wisconsin's Residents." Reflecting the integral role of faith in the lives of our people—symbolizing the significance of a wonderful spiritual heritage to all America—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPIRITUAL LIFE SPURS WISCONSIN'S RESIDENTS

On any other hill, John Weitzer would have turned back long ago, for conquering this steep, winding roadway near Hubertus in southeastern Wisconsin represented lots of exercise for a man 82 years old.

But Weitzer, widely known in West Allis business circles before his retirement a few years ago, kept right on. He has made the trip for the past 46 years.

His wife and 43 relatives kept climbing, too. They realized that the shrines at the top of Holy Hill and the view of the surrounding countryside are well worth the effort.

Weitzer is one of thousands of annual visitors to Holy Hill. Tourists of many religious persuasions flock to the Hill throughout the year, for the Discalced Carmelite Monastery, with its stations of the cross and famed chapel, have become national attractions over the years—just one of the many religious traditions of Wisconsin.

Spiritual life in the State grows at such shrines—as in the hundreds of crossroads houses of worship with tall steeples, and in the great cathedrals in Milwaukee, Madison, Green Bay, and other cities.

Among the larger edifices, Wisconsin's own Frank Lloyd Wright is represented, having designed the Unitarian Church at Madison, and the new Annunciation Greek Orthodox Church on the northwest side of Milwaukee.

The church structures in Wisconsin represent a multimillion-dollar outlay every year. The traditional Gothic style is being priced out of the market, but imported altars, stained glass windows and unique interior decorations keep the church construction totals high.

At least two rural spots are centers of Protestant conclaves and worship.

Conference Point at Williams Bay, Lake Shore, in southern Wisconsin, draws delegates to a "Geneva School of Missions" every year. Also Council of Churches secretaries from all over the Nation gather at Conference Point to talk shop each June.

The other spot is the American Baptist Assembly at Green Lake, in the central part of the State. This is a year-round meeting place, with its heaviest activity during the summer.

This year about 7,500 persons will attend 33 national conferences at Green Lake between June and September.

Some of these are the National Missions Conference, the Christian Writers and Editors Conference, the Christian Education Workers' Conference, the Recreation Leaders' Laboratory, the Older Youth Conference, the Citizenship Conference, etc.

Some of the prominent speakers will be the Reverend Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg of St. Louis, former president of the National Council of Churches; Charles W. Ferguson, senior editor of Reader's Digest; Elizabeth Yates, author; Dr. Roland E. Welseley, professor of journalism at Syracuse University; Dr. Joseph Sittler of Chicago, and Dr. J. Carter Swaim, Bible authority for the National Council of Churches.

Wisconsin has 1,301,474 Roman Catholics in 5 dioceses.

The Milwaukee archdiocese is the largest, headed by Archbishop William E. Cousins. The other dioceses are Green Bay, headed by Bishop Stanislaus V. Bona, and Bishop John B. Grellinger, auxiliary; La Crosse, by Bishop John P. Treacy; Madison, by Bishop William P. O'Connor, and Superior, by Bishop George A. Hammes, consecrated last year.

Wisconsin also has active Jewish congregations of the Orthodox, Reform and Conservative branches. Congregations are autonomous, submitting to no superior organization. They engage their own rabbis and own their own property. Milwaukee and Madison are large Jewish centers.

Wisconsin has at least five large Lutheran groups, which will be reduced by one after 1962, when our Augustana Lutherans will merge with the United Lutherans, represented in Wisconsin by the Wisconsin conference, of which the Reverend Dr. Paul L. Roth, of Kenosha, is president.

Missouri Synod Lutherans in Wisconsin are divided into north and south Wisconsin districts. So are the Wisconsin Synod Lutherans, though the national headquarters of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod is at Milwaukee. The Reverend Oscar J. Naumann is president.

The new American Lutheran Church is also divided into northern and southern districts in Wisconsin, as is the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Three dioceses serve Wisconsin's Episcopalians: Milwaukee, headed by Bishop Donald H. V. Hallock; Eau Claire, by Bishop William Herstick, and Fond du Lac, by Bishop William Brady.

Methodists are divided into eastern and western conferences. Bishop Ralph Taylor Alton of Madison, rounding out his first year of episcopacy, presides over both conferences.

Baptists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Assemblies of God, and Evangelical United Brethren, each have one State unit. The Reverend Ezra G. Roth is serving his last year as executive director of the Wisconsin Baptist State Convention before retirement.

Other State executives are the Reverend Dr. William V. Longbrake of Waukesha, Wisconsin Presbyterian Synod; the Reverend Dr. Jess Norenberg of Madison, Wisconsin Congressional Conference; the Reverend Darwin Heuser of Waupaca, the Wisconsin District of the Assemblies of God, and Bishop Harold R. Heininger of St. Paul, Evangelical United Brethren.

Cooperative Protestant work in the State is guided by the Wisconsin Council of Churches, headed by Methodist Rev. Carl Stromberg of Madison. Ellis H. Dana is executive vice president.

Lutheran organizations knit the congregations of their synods into one unit for charitable works. These include the Lutheran Welfare Society, now in its 25th year as a Wisconsin agency; the Lutheran Children's Friend Society, in its 65th year, and the Lutheran Institutional Mission, in its 60th year.

Discrimination in the Peanut Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. R. POAGE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to clarify the misunderstanding about the differentials established by the Department of Agriculture between the support price of various types of peanuts, it should be understood that there are five major types of peanuts: The Virginia type grown in Virginia and North Carolina; the Southwest Spanish type grown in Texas, Oklahoma and New Mexico; the Southeast Spanish type grown in Georgia, Alabama and Florida; the Runner type also grown in Georgia, Alabama and Florida; and the Valencia type grown almost exclusively in New Mexico.

Next, it should be understood that since the Commodity Credit Corporation support prices are expressed for each type in dollars per "average ton" of farmers' stock or unshelled peanuts, no meaningful comparisons may be made between the support by types since the "average ton" of the various types are not comparable as to kernel content and quality. The meaningful price to the commercial user of peanuts is expressed in support per pound of sound mature kernels, for that is what the commercial buyer uses. The Virginia and Valencia types will contain a substantial percent of premium nuts which will sell for more than the regular sound mature kernels. Likewise, all farmers' stock peanuts will contain a small percentage of immature, split, or otherwise imperfect kernels. These imperfect nuts must naturally bring something considerably less than the sound mature kernels.

For many years the runner type was recognized as an inferior peanut and was considered basically a hog feed. Over the years plant breeders have been able to develop runner peanuts until they now fully compete on even terms with other varieties in the commercial market. In fact, they are preferred to other types by some users. The sheller who buys the farmers' unshelled peanuts and processes them for the manufacturer pays for them principally on the basis of sound mature kernel content. The manufacturer buys peanuts, not by type of "average grade ton," but on the basis

of shelled peanuts. In other words, the buyer of peanuts is not interested in the weight of unshelled—farmers' stock—peanuts. What he wants to know is how many pounds of sound mature kernels he is buying. Of course, if he buys split, damaged or immature kernels, he expects to pay a lesser price, no matter what the type of peanuts.

For a number of years the Department has maintained two differentials in the support price about which there has been considerable argument. Southeastern Spanish type peanuts have in the past been supported at several dollars per ton of sound mature kernels higher than southwestern Spanish type peanuts of the same grade. This differential has gradually been reduced. Last year it was \$2 per ton. This year it has been eliminated. The change has made southeastern Spanish type peanuts more competitive with southwestern Spanish.

At the same time, Runner peanuts have been supported at \$9 per ton of sound mature kernels less than southwestern Spanish peanuts of the same quality. This gives a very decided marketing advantage to the runner type peanuts. The commercial user can and in fact does buy the type of peanuts which gives him the largest amount of sound mature kernels for his money. Growers in the Southwest have contended that all differentials, except premiums for large nuts and nuts for roasting in the shell, should be abolished and supports should be based solely on what the processor actually buys—that is, sound mature kernels with a lesser competitive payment for other kernels. In this way, all types will compete fairly in the market.

Representatives of the Southeast have realized that they enjoy an advantage in the market and have objected to equalizing the differential between Runners and Southwest Spanish-type peanuts, but they asked for and secured an equalization of the differentials in support between southeastern and southwestern Spanish-type peanuts. It is interesting to note that this adjustment was made the first of August in spite of the fact that the southeastern people successfully argued with the Department that it was too late in the season to make any change in the differentials between Runner and Spanish-type peanuts. To the impartial observer this seems to be an unwarranted discrimination on the part of the Department in favor of the Southeast.

To make it clear just what the new support prices do, here is the picture. The support price per pound of sound mature kernels of peanuts is:

	Cents
Virginia type.....	16.00
Southwestern Spanish type.....	15.85
Southeastern Spanish type.....	15.85
Runner type.....	15.45

Thus, it can be seen that the new supports do not, as the Department's news release indicates, continue the 1960 differential which existed between southeastern and southwestern Spanish-type peanuts, but they do continue the differential which has existed between the Runner-type and Spanish-type peanuts.

All that the Virginia-Carolina and the southwestern peanut producers and shellers are asking, since all of these peanuts go to the same end use, is that this differential be eliminated, just as the Department eliminated the differential between the two types of Spanish peanuts. They are completely agreed that the Virginia and high quality larger Valencia peanuts should receive a higher support price. A number of Senators and Representatives from Virginia to Texas have introduced legislation to achieve this result. Hearings were held by the Oilseed Subcommittee but due to the pressure of adjournment these hearings were not completed and will be continued early next session unless the Department shall in the meantime have equalized these supports.

There seems to be some hope that this may happen because the Honorable Stephen Pace, spokesman for the southeastern interests, stated in a letter of August 5 that "we had insisted at the last hearing, July 31, (3) that differentials should be fixed in the fall or first of each year," and he added, "You will observe that the Under Secretary concurs." This would indicate that we could expect action before next session.

As to the nature of the action which we can expect, we can only refer to the Department's report on the bills forwarded to Chairman COOLEY over the Under Secretary's signature on August 24, 1961. In this report Mr. Murphy stated "In the circumstances, and particularly because the planting time for the 1961 crop was past, it did not seem wise to change substantially the differentials established for the prior crop."

At least if we are again denied equal treatment we will have to be given a new reason.

The southwestern producers full well recognize the desirability of maintaining a united front in the peanut industry but they feel very strongly that this unity cannot be purchased at the price of acceptance of any differential between the support price of a pound of sound mature peanut kernels, whether these kernels come from a runner vine in the Southeast or a Spanish bush in the Southwest.

Prescription Drug Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, in the New York Post of Sunday, September 10, 1961, comments in her column on the excessive prices of prescription drugs and the legislation proposed to correct conditions which have caused these prices. Her observations are most timely and provocative. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mrs. Roosevelt's column which deals with the subject of drugs be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have long wanted to mention in this column the public debt of gratitude which I think we owe to the Senate's Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and its energetic chairman, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee.

Anyone who has had even a mild illness knows that the cost of drugs is alarmingly high, and year by year becomes more of a burden, especially to the lower income families.

Modern drugs, like other advances in medicine and surgery, have meant that many more people are alive and well today than would have been a decade ago. Certainly, we must be prepared to pay for the production and advancement of these life-saving drugs and techniques.

I was shocked, however, by the revelations of eminent medical men before Senator KEFAUVER's committee that price-fixing and monopolistic practices have raised the cost of drugs far above what is reasonable or necessary.

I was deeply troubled also by testimony charging that hidden and serious dangers in drugs are not revealed in advertising or information supplied even to doctors—that physicians have no reasonable way of evaluating the conflicting claims, the myriad names, and the bombardment of promotional material.

I was amazed to learn that drugs are often promoted and sold before adequate clinical trials have been performed so that patients very often serve as unwitting guinea pigs.

Senator KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, have sponsored a drug industry antitrust bill (S. 1552) that will go a very long way toward correcting many of the abuses and deficiencies of current practice. This bill would have the effect of increasing competition and diminishing the temptation to fix prices. It would put teeth into the regulation and control of drug manufacture by the Food and Drug Administration. Most important, it would stimulate prescriptions by generic name through long overdue central control over the naming of drugs.

Prescribing drugs by generic name was first advocated by the Citizens' Committee for the Children of New York in its own intensive study of the impact of modern prescription drugs on the family budget, made some 3 years ago prior to the Kefauver investigations.

Labor Day
EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which was broadcast in the public interest by radio and television station WBZ in Boston:

LABOR DAY
(Delivered by Paul G. O'Friel, general manager, WBZ; James E. Allen, general manager, WBZ-TV)

Today we celebrate Labor Day. And appropriately enough there's little public ceremony to mark the occasion. Instead, either at home or off on a trip, most of us will simply be enjoying the many pleasures of modern American living.

There are still shameful pockets of poverty across the country, but generally we Americans have never had it so good. Much of the credit for this prosperity and the time we have to enjoy it must go to the American labor movement. Perhaps the best tribute to those who started that movement is to enjoy the holiday to the hilt.

But this is only 1 day of the year. With the great strides in our economy, average weekly work time has been cut drastically, from 70 hours down to 40 hours or less. The workweek has fallen from 6 days to 5, and some economists see the 3-day weekend in the not-too-distant future. Now there are holidays and leisure time for everyone throughout the year.

We'd like to suggest today that the American public use at least a portion of this new leisure time for the public good. This effort could well be regarded as our repayment to a society which has treated us so well.

This repayment can be made in many ways.

There's a great shortage of volunteer help in most of our communities today. People are badly needed to work in hospitals and homes for the aged, for various religious and civic organizations. They are needed to guide youngsters in groups such as the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and the YMCA.

Nor should we overlook the political world. One of the problems confronting both local and State governments has been the lack of popular participation in politics. The tendency in the past has been to let George do it, and our Georges unfortunately haven't been doing it very well. We must all share responsibility in the democratic process. And this means more than just intelligent voting; it requires continuing interest in the affairs of government, participation in political life.

There's been increasing concern across the country about the lack of national purpose, the decline in our public and private morality. It would be silly to look for a one-shot cure to these problems. But undoubtedly they are based on selfishness. Improvement will come only when people start to think more of the needs of their community and their fellow man.

This is a challenge for us all on this Labor Day, 1961.

**The Pilot Who Led the Way to
Hiroshima**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, bombs of destruction are so much in the limelight these days that one's mind cannot but turn back to the horror of Hiroshima. Our action there is something I have never accepted.

Not too long afterward, when I was flying across the Atlantic, sitting in the copilot's seat with a young pilot. The pilot turned to me, and asked if I had sons, and if they had been in the war. And then very quietly said:

As that is so, Mrs. Bolton, may I talk to you? I must talk to someone.

And then he poured his heart out:

We, a civilized Christian Nation, how could we perpetrate this unspeakable horror?

He said he woke up nights with it before his eyes.

I turned to him very quietly and said:

Son, I feel as you do, particularly so for there was much information indicating that the Japanese had begun to come our way, and that in a week or so they would have asked for peace.

We talked a little of the man who flew the plane that dropped the bomb. Both of us dreaded what might be the after-effects upon him. I have just recently had sent to me a story from the National Guardian of March 27, 1961, under a by-line of Robert E. Light that answers the question of what has become of him. I hope everyone who sees this will read the tragic story of a loyal soldier who obeyed orders—orders that broke his heart, orders that haunt him day and night. These are things that should be brought to our attention as we view the immediate future.

The article follows:

**THE PILOT WHO LED THE WAY TO HIROSHIMA—
THE STORY OF CLAUDE EATHERLY: CON-
SCIENCE OF MAN CONFINED**

The truth is that society simply cannot accept the fact of my guilt without at the same time recognizing its own far deeper guilt.—CLAUDE R. EATHERLY, August 1959.

(By Robert E. Light)

Fourteen years ago Maj. Claude R. Eatherly returned to Texas a war hero. He was acclaimed as the reconnaissance plane pilot who gave the go-ahead signals for the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Today he is a patient in the psychiatric ward of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Waco, Tex., adjudged insane and committed by a county court.

For a decade Eatherly was racked by the memory of the hundreds of thousands he had helped to kill. He wrote to the survivors of Hiroshima begging forgiveness. At home he rejected the hero's mantle and sought society's punishment by a series of crudely committed crimes from forgery to burglary. When he was committed to the hospital January 14, psychiatrists concluded that he was suffering from a guilt complex. The treatment presumably will be directed toward ridding him of guilt feelings.

NEVER AGAIN

But it is clear from Eatherly's writing that he is not insane. He seems to have come to understand what has tormented him and how best to expiate his sin. He said last year that he never expected "to do another antisocial act again." He hopes to "lend influence toward peace, to end nuclear buildup, to safeguard the rights of all people, regardless of race, color, or creed."

It has been suggested that the Air Force intervened to keep him confined. But there is also a move for reexamination of Eatherly by an international panel of psychiatrists—a move initiated by Austrian philosopher Dr. Guenther Anders.

THE BEGINNING

In 1945 Eatherly was one of a group of "superpilots" assembled for a secret mission in the 509th Composite Group on Tinian Island in the Marianas. Each had a top service record and had passed a thorough security check. None knew the precise nature of the assignment.

Newsweek (May 25, 1959) said that Eatherly was "an enlistment-poster figure then: A tall, sun-burned wavy-haired Texan, carefree and convivial on the ground, calm and stable in the air."

In its decision to drop the bomb, according to the book "No High Ground" by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, the U.S. high command sought a target which would

"include both a military installation and surrounding houses and buildings susceptible to maximum blast damage." Target cities were limited to Hiroshima, Kokura, and Nagasaki, in that order of priority.

BOMB PRIMARY

At 1:37 a.m. on August 6, 1945, three B-29 weather scout planes took off for the target cities. Eatherly flew the *Straight Flush* over Hiroshima with orders to radio the bomb-carrying *Enola Gay* if weather conditions were favorable for a bombing. Only the *Enola Gay* crew knew of the atom bomb; Eatherly knew only that the raid was something special.

At 7:09 a.m. the *Straight Flush* reached Hiroshima. A cloud bank rimmed the city, but there was a clear hole with a diameter of more than 10 miles. At 7:25 Eatherly radioed the *Enola Gays* "Advice. Bomb Primary." An hour later the first atomic bomb exploded in anger fell on Hiroshima. *Enola Gay* copilot Capt. Robert A. Lewis, on seeing the mushroom cloud said: "My God, what have we done?" The answer was later tabulated: 78,150 dead, 37,425 injured, 13,083 missing.

Three days later Eatherly flew the same mission over Nagasaki. He also flew reconnaissance missions over the cities with instruments to record the damage.

THE HERO HOME

Eatherly resigned his commission in 1947, after 7 years in service and returned to Texas. He was acclaimed and publicized as a national hero. But his wife said he used to wake up at night screaming, "Ball out, ball out."

His anguish increased when his wife suffered miscarriages of malformed fetuses in 1947 and 1948. Subsequent tests indicated that many of his sperm cells had become peculiarly malformed.

Two daughters were eventually born to the Eatherlys, one in 1950 and the other in 1954, but both were found to have a rare blood disease similar to pernicious anemia. Blood tests at the time showed that Eatherly suffered from the same blood ailment.

Before Eatherly resigned his commission, he had participated in atomic bomb tests at Bikini; after one such test his plane had been isolated and washed down. But no one had ever told him that he might have been exposed to radiation.

In 1950 Eatherly began to wander around the South and Southwest. He was drinking heavily. He was arrested in New Orleans, Beaumont, and Houston, on charges of forgery, robbery, and breaking and entering. Police and courts were lenient because he was a "war hero."

Nine times Eatherly entered the Waco VA hospital as a volunteer patient. In April 1959, he told Dr. O. P. Constantine: "I feel I killed all those people at Hiroshima." While he was out of the hospital on a 90-day trial period in 1956, he and another patient were questioned about a series of robberies. Eatherly said: "I don't know why we did it. We didn't need the money."

A CLASSIC CASE

Eatherly twice attempted suicide. Waco psychiatrists described his case as "neurosis with psychotic manifestations" and "a classic guilt complex."

One psychiatrist said that "he has sought the punishment of society by acts which would bring down its wrath. 'But,' he added, 'the role of therapy is to get at the predisposing factors—Hiroshima in itself is not enough to explain his behavior.'"

Eatherly believes that Hiroshima is the cause of his actions. In 1959, he began to correspond with Dr. Anders in Vienna. (Anders had written to him after reading a story about him in *Newsweek*.) Anders is a noted philosopher and author of "New Morals in the Atomic Age." Their correspond-

ence indicates that Eatherly has come to understand his inner torment and wants to publicize it so that society will recognize "its own far deeper guilt."

He wrote to Anders in August 1959:

"I accept the fact that I am unlikely to bring about that recognition by getting into scrapes with the law, that I have been doing in my determination to shatter the hero image of me by which society has sought to perpetuate its own complacency."

HE CANNOT LEAVE

Last November 22 Eatherly left the Waco Hospital, in accordance with his rights as a volunteer patient, and never returned. The Washington Post and Times-Herald (Dec. 5, 1960) reported that "VA officials said they have no authority to arrest Eatherly or take him back to the hospital." But Eatherly was picked up and on January 14, on request of his brother, was declared insane, and committed. As an involuntary patient he cannot leave.

On learning of Eatherly's commitment, Anders wrote to President Kennedy and simultaneously released the letter to the press. It caused a stir in Europe. Psychiatrists in several countries have shown interest. Bertrand Russell wrote in the London New Statesman (Feb. 17) that Eatherly's statements "are entirely sane." But no U.S. publication has picked up Anders' letter and no group is working for Eatherly's release.

AGE OF THE APPARATUS

In his letter, Anders called Eatherly's case "a moral scandal which threatens to go down in history as the Dreyfus affair of the 20th century—no, perhaps as an even more fateful affair." To Anders, Eatherly is "the attempt to keep conscience alive in the age of the apparatus."

Anders wrote that the court's "verdict contradicts the facts." He said, "Every reasonable medical man knows: It is abnormal to act normally during or after an abnormal situation. It is abnormal if, after an appalling shock, someone goes on living as if nothing has happened."

He recalled Getthold Lessing's words: "He who doesn't lose his mind over certain things, has none to lose."

Anders explained that "through his sham criminal action [Eatherly] has tried to enforce that punishment which was not granted him." He suggested that the United States could not accept Eatherly's remorse because it "would have been an indictment . . . against the Hiroshima mission."

He also asked whether the VA psychiatrists understood the criminal acts as reactions to his guilt over Hiroshima and would treat him properly.

Anders said: "It looks as if the Air Force exerted pressure on the hospital staff . . . to keep Eatherly interned indefinitely." He questioned the legality of arresting Eatherly after his voluntary departure from the hospital.

He proposed an international commission of psychiatrists—for instance, a Swede, a doctor from India, a Pole, and a Japanese—to reexamine Eatherly. Anders included excerpts from Eatherly's letters:

June 21, 1959: "My personal experience needs to be studied if its true significance, not only for myself, but for all men everywhere, is to be grasped."

August 22, 1959: "It seems that those sleeping under the ashes of Hiroshima were crying something for peace. I hope that people could together, hand in hand, make a better world."

August 1959: "One has only one life, and if the experiences of my life can be used for the benefit of the human race, then that is the way it will be used, not for money nor fame, but because of the responsibility I own toward everyone. In that way I will receive a great benefit and relieve my guilt."

May 27, 1959: "To most people my method of rebellion against war is that of an insane person. No other way could I have made people realize that nuclear war is a moral degeneration as well as physically destructive."

Eatherly's words are not insane: the imbalance rather is in those who would make "bigger and better" bombs. Anders put it thus: "Happy the times in which the insane speak out this way; wretched the times in which only the insane speak out this way."

A FELLOW VICTIM

On July 24, 1959, 30 Hiroshima girls suffering from "the atomic sickness" wrote to Eatherly "to convey our sincere sympathy with you and to assure you that we do not harbor any sense of enmity to you personally—you are also a victim like us."

If Eatherly is a "Hiroshima victim," then these questions must be asked:

Will he be "cured" by shutting him away, or by allowing him to go out in the world to testify against war?

Is he being labeled insane so that the war-makers may bear the seal of sanity?

By permitting him to be confined, is society seeking to still its own conscience?

These are questions a nuclear age society must answer to Eatherly. To itself it must answer: For whom is Eatherly dangerous? And the answer must be: To all of us, if we do not heed his cry.

Those whose conscience is not interned might follow Dr. Anders' lead and write to President Kennedy in behalf of Eatherly's freedom.

Propane Gas Import Restrictions Should Be Lifted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has presently under consideration the question of the need of lifting of the restrictions on the importation of residual oil. I wish to point out that during the consideration of this question, we must not overlook an additional product which is now restricted and on which such restrictions should have been lifted.

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the importation of propane gas.

An objective study of the background leading to the issuance of the President's proclamation on import restrictions indicates that mandatory import controls were not intended to apply to propane and could not reasonably have been an influencing factor in the issuance of the proclamation. The proclamation was based upon a report of the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. The Director's analysis in no instance makes any reference to propane gas or to "unfinished products." It is also important to note that propane was not included under the voluntary control program. It is apparent from this cursory examination that propane was not an influencing factor in the promulgation of the President's proclamation, as can be amply demonstrated from that fact that no propane was imported

into district 1 through 4 during the period covered by the Director's report. Furthermore, there has been and is no allocation for the importation of propane.

Therefore, it is obvious that an order to prevent importation could not and should not apply to a product that was not at the time even being imported.

It is also clear that the importation of propane had absolutely no effect upon the growth and development of the domestic propane business or on the production of crude oil or unfinished products. It is obvious that propane was not intended for mandatory control and the Director should decontrol propane.

The unique position of Florida, Mr. Speaker, makes it desirable and necessary to decontrol the importation of propane into Florida. This would be true, even if it were found reasonable and justifiable to impose controls upon the importation of propane. In my view, there is no such justification.

Notwithstanding that, however, Florida does have a special case. Florida is the 10th leading State in the consumption of propane, with an expected phenomenal increase in population, and a corresponding increase in propane consumption. It has no underground storage facilities and the geophysical structure of the soil does not make such facilities feasible. It has no production of propane and has a wide seasonal fluctuation in demand and consumption.

In addition, Florida is far removed from the sources of domestic propane and, therefore, has an unusually long supply line which makes the cost of transportation of domestic propane extremely high. The facts show that historically, over an average period, transportation amounts to over 50 percent of the cost of the product delivered in Florida by tank cars.

In the Miami area alone, there are over 15,000 household consumers who are entirely dependent on propane for home-heating purposes. Florida produces no coal, natural gas, or oil products, and must rely upon products from outside, distant sources for such heating fuels. Electric power is not available for mass space-heating needs. One only needs to briefly examine the newspapers of my district during any winter season to see the urgings of the power company that residents do not make unnecessary demand upon electric consumption for heating purposes and, strange as it may seem, the power company urges people to convert to other sources such as oil or propane for space-heating purposes.

Notwithstanding this unique demand and the unusual position of Florida, the importation needs are comparatively quite small and could not in any sense, adversely affect competition with fuel oil, coal or other domestically produced fuels. It has been estimated that the needs in my area are 1 percent of the total propane produced or consumed in the United States. It is, therefore, Mr. Speaker, extremely difficult to perceive how an importation of this amount could in anywise adversely affect competition with other heating fuels.

Fundamentally though, Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to understand how the

importation of propane gas could in anywise impair national security or result in damage to the oil import program.

Therefore, the refusal to decontrol the importation of propane into Florida is completely unjustified on the basis of the national security or unjust competition and only results in severe hardship and higher costs to the users of this product in my district.

Troika Crisis Looms in Redistricting Hassle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting and most timely statement of Mr. Charles H. McGlue, former special assistant attorney of Massachusetts on the subject of redistricting.

TROIKA CRISIS LOOMS IN REDISTRICTING HASSLE

Early in the first F.D.R. administration, the word "troika" would recall memories of "La Troika," a Russian night spot on Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C., just below the then newly opened swank Hotel Mayflower, or perhaps the familiar three-horse Russian sleigh which made its appearance in "A Night at the Garden" in a very intriguing scene in the Russian musical, "Chauve-Souris."

"Troika" today has an entirely different connotation. It is a Khrushchev expression for a three-way operation to administer or maladminister a given proposition. The Troika setup is a factor in the congressional redistricting problems, affecting three States; namely, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania. In each of these three States, there is a potential deadlock that might result in requiring all Congressmen to be elected at large.

TROIKA DILEMMA

Massachusetts has a Democratic senate, a Democratic house of representatives but a Republican Governor. Illinois has a Republican senate, a Democratic house of representatives, but a Democratic Governor. Pennsylvania has an evenly divided senate, 25 Republicans and 25 Democrats, a Democratic house of representatives, and a Democratic Governor. In accordance with the population count in 1960 national census, Massachusetts will lose two Congressmen, dropping from 14 to 12; Illinois will lose one Congressman, dropping from 25 to 24; while Pennsylvania will lose three Congressmen, dropping from 30 to 27.

The law governing congressional redistricting generally requires the passage of a redistricting measure through both State legislative branches together with the signature of the Governor of each State. The case of *Smiley v. Holm* (285 U.S. 355 (1932)) determined that a redistricting act in order to be legal required the same process as that of any legislative bill and that the term "legislature" as used in article IV section 1 of the U.S. Constitution, referred to the legislative power of the State however it might be distributed.

Thus it becomes obvious that in each of these three States there must be an agreement for the passage of some form of redistricting, or in lieu thereof, Massachusetts, Illinois, and Pennsylvania must resort to a superchaotic election-at-large for all their Congressmen in November 1962.

The existing U.S. statute on redistricting States that if the number of Representatives (Congressmen) is decreased and the number of districts in the State exceeds that number, then all are elected at large. However, Congress still retains its constitutional right to change the statutory provisions at any time. Also, the constitutional right of Congress to be final judge of the elections and qualifications of its own Members should not be overlooked. U.S. Constitution, article 1, section 5.

CONGRESSMAN CELLER

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, has made an exhaustive study of the problems arising from congressional redistricting. Representative CELLER states that the question of congressional control over the acts of the State legislatures regarding apportionment was first met in 1843 when objections were raised concerning the election of certain Members from States wherein the elections were not held by districts. By parliamentary maneuver the House avoided the direct issue and the Members in question retained their seats. In 1901, the power of Congress to regulate districts was challenged in an election case, but this time the House took no action and the Member retained his seat. In 1910 the House was faced with a similar issue, but no action was taken.

Although the most direct attack upon the power of the Congress to regulate redistricting under article 1, section 4 of the Constitution is found in the reports of the House itself, it appears to be well-established by the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court that the Congress has general supervisory power over the subject of the elections of the Representatives, including the matter in which a State is divided into congressional districts. (*Smiley v. Holm* (285 U.S. 355 (1932)), *Ex Parte Siebold* (100 U.S. 371 (1879)), *Ex Parte Yarborough* (110 U.S. 651 (188-)), *Wood v. Broom* (287 U.S. 1 (1932)), *Colegrove v. Green* (328 U.S. 549 (1946)).)

JUSTICE FRANKFURTER'S OPINION

In the case of *Colegrove v. Green* (328 U.S. 549 (1946)) Mr. Justice Frankfurter in a majority opinion of the U.S. Supreme Court invited congressional action in the following statement:

"The one stark fact that emerges from a study of the history of congressional apportionment is its embroilment in politics, in a sense of party contests and party interests. The Constitution enjoins upon Congress the duty of apportioning representatives among the several States according to their respective number (art. I, sec. 2). Yet Congress has at times been heedless of this command and has not apportioned according to the requirements of the census. It never occurred to anyone that this Court could issue mandamus to compel Congress to perform its mandatory duty to apportion. 'What might not be done directly by mandamus could not be attained indirectly by injunction' (Chaffe) congressional reapportionment (1929), 42 Harvard Law Review 1015-1019."

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CELLER

"In the light of the court decisions and the legislative enactments, the importance of the problem of fair, equitable apportionment both by the Federal and State legislatures is one that demands a final and prompt solution.

"It must be a solution which goes to the very root of the problem and eradicates the sources of the evil. A mere glance at the contours of various congressional districts and the wide variances in the population of these districts compels the conclusion that

the drawing of congressional districts cannot be left to the whims and uncontrolled discretion of the State legislatures. The problem is one that involves the fundamental principle of equality which permeates our entire Constitution so that this denial imperils the very heart of our democracy."

Services Losing a Great Friend in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE M. KILGORE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives to an article appearing in the September 9, 1961, issue of Army Times with reference to our esteemed colleague, Representative PAUL KILDAY, of San Antonio, Tex.

This article is a tribute to the services Representative KILDAY has offered over his years on the Armed Services Committee and on the House floor to the men and women of the military services. Because I feel it applies equally to his services to the civilian element as well, and to the country as a whole, and because it so clearly describes his many fine attributes, under unanimous consent, I include this commentary on Representative KILDAY's unique abilities in the Appendix of the RECORD. I know all of us who have been privileged to serve with him will heartily agree with the closing sentiment of this article, "I'm Sorry To See Him Go," and will wish him Godspeed in his new capacity as judge on the Court of Military Appeals.

The article follows:

SERVICES LOSING A GREAT FRIEND IN CONGRESS (By John J. Ford)

The men and women of the military services are losing as good a friend as they ever had on Capitol Hill.

That's because PAUL J. KILDAY, the gentleman from Texas, is retiring from Congress. Members of Congress are always called gentlemen all the time but Mr. KILDAY always was one. He was also the most knowledgeable man in the Congress on military personnel legislation and the champion of service people at every turn. He fought a great many battles for them and he very seldom lost any. I can't help but wonder if their battles will be won as often in the future when he's not there.

There are good men and true in the House and in the Senate who are concerned about the welfare of servicemen and their families. But there is only one PAUL KILDAY. The subcommittee of which he was chairman has undoubtedly written more legislation of benefit to military personnel than any other in the history of the Congress. The dependent medical care law, career improvement bills for doctors, nurses, trailer owners, pilots, divers and many other groups needing special help, the improvements to the Justice Code, the Career Compensation Act, the last three pay raises—all were written by Mr. KILDAY's subcommittee. And after they were written he guided them through the committee and through the House.

There are 37 members on the Armed Services Committee. That's a lot of politicians to bring into agreement and on difficult leg-

islation they can get themselves embroiled in some monumental confusion. Time and again in such situations Mr. KILDAY would ask for recognition, explain the situation clearly and lucidly and suggest the most reasonable solution. The committee would accept it, like men shown the light, and that would be that.

I have spent the better part of the last 7 years listening to politicians talk. It is not an occupation calculated to increase one's appreciation for the spoken word. But PAUL KILDAY was a joy to listen to. He has as good a voice, as clear a mind and as even a temperament as any man I ever knew.

One place where this showed so clearly, and where the Armed Services Committee is likely to miss him so much, is on the floor of the House. His great prestige in the House helped to gain passage for bills that might have had a rough time without him. A case in point was the recent accrual flight pay bill debate.

For those who do not understand the background of the bill it would be easy to criticize it as a measure to "pay officers for not flying." An unskilled floor manager would have had a very unhappy afternoon defending the bill. But Mr. KILDAY handled it so skillfully that by the end of the debate he had the midwestern archconservatives congratulating him for saving the taxpayers' money.

The bills he handled were often, of necessity, extremely complex but his explanations of them were wonderfully lucid. He could always put the problems of the military into clear focus for the Members of the House. They relied on him and few indeed were willing to do battle with him. Fortune magazine called him 1 of the 10 most influential men in the House and Senate on military affairs.

PAUL KILDAY was born with a temperament for leadership. Over the last 7 years I must have covered 90 percent of his committee hearings and most of his floor debates. I never saw him lose his temper. I never saw him angry. I never saw him lose control of a political situation. He was always calm and he was always in command.

He also has those rare political qualities of humor and humility. Political leaders are vain by nature. If you can get them intelligent and honest and energetic that's usually the most you should hope for; you must expect them to be towering egotists. But KILDAY looks at the world and his place in it with humility and detachment. He'll probably be less impressed with a column like this than just about anyone else in the Congress.

In the nature of things most military people will be unaware of the debt they owe to PAUL KILDAY. But they shouldn't be.

Mr. KILDAY won't be entirely out of military personnel matters. He's been appointed a judge on the Court of Military Appeals.

But I hope those of you in the military service will pause to think of what PAUL KILDAY has accomplished in 22 years in the Congress. I'm sorry to see him go. When he's gone, reporting won't be as much fun for me—and the living might not be as good for you.

Safety Program of the Mifflin Toppers 4-H Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I

include in the RECORD the following material, which was distributed by the Mifflin Toppers 4-H Club at the Iowa County Fair. I feel this club is doing a great job in calling attention to safety-first measures that should be practiced around the home and farm:

As part of our safety program this year we would like to spread a little fear. It isn't always the other fellow who gets hurt. So, with these such dangers never flirt:

Being careless with firearms.
Poison in reach of children.
Swimming alone.
Boating without lifejackets.
Power mowers.
P.T.O.—all working parts of farm machinery.
Cutting traffic law corners, etc.

It is a bit ominous we'll admit
But we just want you to think a bit
And perhaps by spreading our safety alert
A few major and minor mishaps we'll all avert.

Along with safety comes good health, too
The blessings it gives us aren't just a few
Don't forget to be wise when you eat
Also good posture is an important feat.

Especially to young folks who may be tempted to slouch
Stand straight and tall
You'll feel better we vouch.

Think safety first.
Have fun at the fair.

MIFFLIN TOPPERS 4-H CLUB.

Bob Lusk Gives Eyewitness Report on Quemoy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, South Dakota's talented Bob Lusk, editor and publisher of the Daily Plainsman of Huron, S. Dak., is presently on a world tour reporting to his many readers conditions abroad as he observes them. His wife and daughter are accompanying him on this globe-circling venture.

Very recently, Bob Lusk spent a day on Quemoy. His impressions are most informative and encouraging. I ask that the column he wrote following that visit together with a piece of equal interest which he wrote about Formosa, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Sept. 7, 1961]

STEPPINGSTONE TO MAINLAND—FAR EAST'S "GIBRALTAR" THORN IN REDS' SIDE

(By Robert D. Lusk)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—There would be less talk about abandoning Quemoy and Matsu to the Red Chinese if the public knew a little more about these very important islands.

This, apparently, is the conclusion that the Nationalist Chinese have reached, with the result that we spent a day visiting the military installation on Kinman Island, as the Chinese call Quemoy.

The conclusion that our group of visitors without exception reached after seeing Quemoy is that any talk of giving it up makes absolutely no sense at all.

Quemoy is a small island, about 7 or 8 miles long and from a half to 2 or 3 miles wide. A ridge of rocky hills runs along it. It is surrounded on three sides by Red China across straits from less than a mile to several wide.

PLANES FLY LOW

We flew the hundred miles from a military base on Taiwan to Quemoy in Chinese Nationalist army planes. The last few miles, the planes dropped to 100 feet from the water to avoid the Red Chinese radar. We all had to put on lifejackets, despite the sticky heat which prevails in this part of the world at this time of year.

We were assured by our military guides that there was nothing to worry about as this was an even-numbered day and the Reds didn't bomb Quemoy except on odd-numbered days. In fact there had been no bombing for several days, a fact that no one seemed to be able to explain. But since the bombings started, more than 800,000 shells have been lobbed onto Quemoy.

HEAVILY MINED BEACH

We landed on a beach on a part of the island that looks for all the world like the South Dakota Badlands. Aside from the runway, the beach was covered with barbed wire and was heavily mined. Our plane was run into a prepared hiding place and we boarded jeeps for a trip around the island. Quemoy is very deceptive looking. A casual glance reveals only a bit of rather bleak and rugged terrain. But look closer. See that slit in the rock. Something is sticking out of it. It's a machinegun. Then you begin to get the idea. You study the scene more carefully. Everywhere are gun emplacements. Everywhere are camouflaged entrances to caves where soldiers live, armed and at battle alert.

In between these caves may be fields of crops being casually cultivated by the natives of Quemoy who continue to walk behind their bullock-drawn plows despite the hot-cold war that goes on around them.

MEN ARE THERE

The tour of duty on Quemoy for the Nationalist Chinese is 1 year, and of Taiwan's 600,000 troops, it is estimated that one-sixth are on Quemoy. A several-hour drive over the island will reveal a couple of hundred. But the men are there. You pass a small mountain. There is nothing to see but rock. But this mountain houses, in tunnels that cut into and through it like an anthill, a whole division of 14,000 men.

We had lunch in the middle of one such mountain. It was the general headquarters for the island. I asked whether it was safe against nuclear weapons.

"What do you think?" was the reply. "There are 600 feet of granite overhead."

During the 1960 political campaign in the United States there were suggestions made that "we can't defend Quemoy" and that "we should give it up."

HELL OF A FIGHT

We don't have to defend it. The Nationalist Chinese will defend it. And there is going to be one hell of a fight if the Communists try to take it. They have tried a couple of times with heavy casualties and no success. I am no military expert to say whether it could be taken, but I can well believe outside military experts who have said that they would hate to have to try to take it.

So there stands Quemoy, outpost of freedom, manned by 100,000 troops and stocked with great underground warehouses of ammunition.

The Red Chinese are going to have to take this Far Eastern Gibraltar before they can

break out of the mainland; and it would seem to be a fair bet that the only way they're ever going to take it is if some jughead in Washington gives it to them.

For my part, Quemoy is one of the most reassuring things I've seen in the Far East. And I hope it not only can serve as a block to Communist expansion, but as a stepping-stone to an invasion that will someday free the Red Chinese on the mainland.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Sept. 8, 1961]

OR IS IT REST OF WORLD?—FORMOSA OUT OF STEP IN DEALING WITH REDS

(By Robert D. Lusk)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN (Formosa).—In today's mixed-up world, Taiwan is difficult to understand.

To a pacifist, bombing Japan, Taiwan is an irritation. To America which has talked "containment" and holding the line, as it let Laos go and Cuba grow as a Communist outpost in the Western Hemisphere, Taiwan is out of step.

In a world that is ready to compromise on Berlin, that fears communism, public opinion, and asserting its own strength, Gen. Chiang Kai-shek is not a popular figure, but is tolerated because in a free world that can summon little courage in the face of the enemy it is difficult to get up the courage to deal adversely with a friend.

VICTORY OVER COMMUNISM

Chiang Kai-shek and Taiwan have long since made up their minds about their roles in today's world. They are not for "containment," for holding the line, for apologizing for freedom; they are for carrying the war to the Communist world and defeating it. They are for freeing "mainland" Chinese from Red tyranny. They are for victory over communism.

Taiwan is a beautiful land of green mountains, of rich valleys and of great rivers. Today it is prosperous as never before. But it is a dedicated land, with a dedication that is always apparent, always present.

VISITORS CONFUSED

The visitor from elsewhere in the free world is confused, and even vaguely amused, as if watching a people playing at war day after day, year after year.

How could this little island with its 2 million "mainlanders" and 8 million Taiwanese hope to win out against 600 million Red Chinese?

Hunger and hate on the mainland are the basis for hope in Taiwan. There have been, they will point out to you, 30,000 recorded uprisings of one sort or another in Red China in the last decade. Someday, with the help of Taiwan, the whole Red tyranny will be overthrown.

NEXT 5 YEARS

I asked Chiang Kai-shek when they expected to return to the mainland and he replied that it would be in the next 5 years.

He said his intelligence agents have reported a breakdown of internal security in Red China. The Chinese Nationalist forces retreated to Taiwan in 1949.

Replying to questions by a group of more than 60 U.S. editors and publishers and their wives, Chiang said he foresaw an uprising on the mainland in the near future.

ISLANDS IMPORTANT

He told the Americans, on a tour of the Far East sponsored by the National Editorial Association, that his Government attaches equal importance to the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. "Like Berlin, the offshore islands are obstacles to Communist expansion and aggression," he said.

Madame Chiang was seated with her husband during the interview. At one point she said, "Quemoy and Matsu are like the right and left eyes of China. Which is more im-

portant, your left or right eye?" The American audience laughed in approval.

BAD TO WORSE

Chiang told the group that in Hong Kong you can find out from refugees about the conditions on the mainland. He said conditions on the mainland had gone from bad to worse.

"The terror, hunger, slave labor, and death brought on by the Red dictatorship is unbearable to the Chinese on the mainland," he said.

All of this may seem to those from the land of containment as a disturbing and ludicrous statement out of a "never-never land;" yet maybe this disquieting feeling arises from our own guilt; our own inability to make up our minds to the fact that victory in the cold war will come only to those who are ready and willing to fight for it.

HARD TO UNDERSTAND

Maybe someday, a day when the West screws up its courage to rid the world of communism, to bring freedom to people everywhere, we will understand better the determination of the Taiwan Chinese to bring freedom to their fellow Chinese on the mainland.

And when that time comes we will be more appreciative of the important logistic fact that today Nationalist China is maintaining a splendid army of 600,000 men on the side of freedom on a strong springboard base 100 miles from Red China.

The Will To Resist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, a remarkable essay was written by 17-year old Dianne Kerr, of Pacific Palisades, Calif. I think so well of it that I commend it to the Members of the House for study:

THE WILL TO RESIST

It is our plan to "break the will to resist" (stated by the Communists).

America is a Nation which has grown up resisting. In 1620 the Pilgrims landed on Plymouth Rock, resisting the religious persecution in Europe. In 1775 the Revolutionary War was fought, resisting the unrepresentative government controlled by the British. In 1812 the War of 1812 was fought, resisting the control England and France tried to extend over the foreign trade of the United States. In 1861 the Civil War was fought, resisting both the ownership of slaves and the division of the Union. In 1918 the First World War was fought, resisting the spread of dictatorships. Likewise in 1941 World War II was fought to defend democracies against fascism. Our ancestors had the will and the strength to fight for what they believed to be right; and to resist what they believed to be wrong, but do Americans today possess this strength and this will?

Communism seems to have found a new weapon, one which was not used against our ancestors—ideological warfare. Ideological warfare is a weapon dreadfully harmful and although not physically deadly, is deadly to the soul—our mind's guide. It is this weapon which the Communists are using to kill democracy from within. By employing various ideological methods the Communists are destroying America's resistance.

First of all, the Communists use every chance they get to actually destroy America's prestige abroad. But more harmful than destroying foreigners' faith in America, is the destruction of Americans' faith in America. This is what the Communists are achieving. By planting trained Communists throughout the American society, to mix with the average population, Communist views can be supplanted in the open-minded individual. Within the individuals mind the initiated idea grows and he doubts the ability of America's leaders, the correctness of America's policies, and the worth of democracy. Losses piled on the United States (Laos, Cuba, etc.) disfavor felt toward America, and leaders of our country admitting defeat (prominent Americans' belief that America's prestige abroad extremely low) as viewed in the newspapers, add to the infiltrated American's doubts. The defeatist, or useless attitude is then acquired by the doubter, and the Communists' inroad into America's democratic resistance is a little deeper.

The Communists are also destroying American resistance by creating false ideals. The first of these is peace. Naturally peace has always been a desired ideal by the American. Like people everywhere he dislikes killing and abhors destruction, especially if his loved one is being killed or his possessions are being destroyed. Yet Americans have always resisted wrong and if necessary fought for right. Even if it meant the contribution of his life, the American would donate it for his country. In fact, Patrick Henry regretted that he had but one life to give for his country. But in America today a different atmosphere prevails—a passive atmosphere. I cannot believe that Americans, of their own free will, do not wish to fight aggression. The passive atmosphere must prevail because the Communists have created peace as a false ideal. Instead of peace being set up as a goal for coexistence to flourish under, the Communists have encouraged the American to preserve peace at all costs. A perfect example of preserving peace at all costs, finally led up to World War II. The British bought time by handing Hitler Europe piece by piece, a passivist movement, which did not work.

Any mother can tell you that giving a child candy to keep him from writing on the walls will only divert his attention until the candy is gone, when he will resume his previous action. However, if he is rewarded with a spanking it is unlikely that he will continue to mark on the walls. So it is with nations. As you can see, peace cannot always be preserved. In fact as long as peace within your own household is impossible to keep, peace within the world of nations will remain impossible; and the passive ideal—unrealistically tagged peace by the Communists—is a false pretention destroying the American will to resist.

The second false ideal created by the Communists is security. If you look around, you can observe the security Americans are establishing for themselves. Every male is expected to obtain a college education if he plans to be successful. He then must acquire a worthwhile job before most parents will give away their daughter. The couple then are careful to acquire insurance, make investments, save money, and build up any other additional security, which will protect them supposedly from the world. Because of this seemingly American idol—security—the elected representatives of our Government are trying their hardest to make every individual more secure. Laws are being passed to take care of widows, orphans, the sick, the unemployed, and the aged. The Government is planning on giving Federal aid to education and already

sponsors various plans to allow most anyone the chance to attend college. All this insures the American of a better life—a more secure life. But is a secure life a happy life?

In Sweden—a democratic nation where security flourishes—the people are still not content. For although the older person enjoys security, the teenager and young adult desire something else. They want a chance to build their own life; to make a success of themselves. All through history man has reached out of his present position and left security behind. The Pilgrims left their homes and security, and sailed for a wilderness they knew nothing about; the American pioneers left their homes to move West, forgetting security; Carnegie and other foreigners left their homelands to come to America, waving off security; Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Alva Edison, and others in the field of science, who invested either (or both) their lives and fortunes in their work, gave up security; in fact all the men and women in American history who stepped from their positions, leaving their homes and reaching for something better, traded security for the chance to prove that they could be successful. The teenager and the young adult have unlimited faith, immense daring and curiosity, and a wealth of adventurous energy. Yet all this initiative is being overlooked as the Communists influence the older generation, assuring them that security will create an atmosphere of happiness, destroying all worries. But complete security, or security at all costs, is socialism; and like peace, security is only good to an extent. When it destroys the will to understand, explore, and resist, it becomes a misleading ideal not worth having.

Now that we have observed how the Communists are destroying us, by destroying our will to resist, mainly through the creation of false images—peace and security—we Americans must decide what America's real ideals are. What do the American people really want?

Would the doctor prefer to treat as many patients successfully of his own choosing as he can; or would he prefer to treat those assigned him by the Government—one week 5 patients and maybe another week 25, with equal pay for both weeks of work? Naturally the first way of practicing is more acceptable—the democratic way. The teacher too undoubtedly would prefer to teach a child to think independently, by using his own methods, rather than ordered by his superiors to follow a strict plan. The farmer would much prefer growing as much of any crop he desires and selling it for any price he can get, rather than working on a collective farm where all workers receive according to their need (depends on the number in the farmer's family) and work according to their ability. The scientists too would prefer to delve into whatever subject interested him, rather than studying that which the Government delegated. Of course the factory and labor workers prefer their privileges; the right to strike or quit, rather than being forced to do a certain job until the Government decided differently. Even though all these preferences may be achieved under democracy—impossible under communism—even more extensive privileges are afforded the American people. Preserved since the beginning of the United States the ideals set forth in the Constitution and in the first 10 amendments are extended to all citizens. Taken lightly, perhaps, yet terribly important to all Americans are the rights of freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, the right to vote for representatives to the U.S. Government, freedom to travel throughout the Nation, freedom of speech, free enterprise, and

various other rights, which only a democracy has to offer. There is not possible way of obtaining the above ideals except under a democratic government. Therefore in order to preserve these great American ideals we must defend our American democracy, not only by words but with deeds, remembering that faith without works is dead. We Americans must not become intellectually lazy, intoxicated with entertainment, limited in our horizons, and inherently selfish, as the Communists have already accused us. We must find time to educate ourselves, recognize our enemy, and proceed to help destroy him. We in the United States must regain our will to resist, we must not be afraid to vote for someone who advocates old-fashioned, but real American ideas, for we live in a democracy. It is our duty to vote for those who we believe can lead our country best, to give our representatives our opinions and views through letters, to adopt true American principles (and stand for them) and to attack communism the best we can whenever and wherever we might encounter it.

Americans, I urge you not to let the Communists destroy your will to resist, unless you're an un-American coward, who would rather be Red than dead.

Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961

SPEECH
OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, since H.R. 8666, along with numerous other bills today, is being processed under suspension of the rules, an amendment would be out of order. I feel it necessary to call to the attention of the House certain inconsistencies in the operation of the cultural exchange program that I hope the committee will consider and I certainly hope will adopt in the coming years.

I wish to direct your attention to section 109, amending the Immigration and Nationality Act, and I call your particular attention to subsection (e) which provides that a foreign exchange student who acquires his training and skill in the United States may return to this country for admission as a permanent resident after spending 2 years out of the country upon his departure after completing his training program.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told on numerous occasions that the purpose of training foreign students here in the United States is that they will return to their native lands and use their newly acquired skills and knowledge to advance living standards in their native countries. Certainly, when they acquire permanent residence in the United States to practice their skill they in effect violate the intention of the cultural exchange and education program.

I am positive that many Members of the House have shared my experience in receiving requests to introduce private

legislation to establish permanent residence for exchange students here in the United States. Many of them come to this country with no intention of returning to their native lands once educated here and use every conceivable gimmick to remain.

Mr. Speaker, had this bill been brought to the House under normal procedure, I was prepared to offer an amendment requiring that the student reside in his native country for at least 5 years following his departure from the United States so that for at least that nominal amount of time the people of his native land could benefit from his acquired skill.

I certainly hope the Foreign Affairs Committee will give this matter its earnest consideration so that a practical solution could be forthcoming to adjust the abuses now prevalent in this program.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, although I feel, in the spirit of constructive criticism, that some of the demerits or the weaknesses ought to be pointed out to the House in the hope that perhaps in years to come they might be perfected. For example, there is the question of exchanges of artists and the American performers. We could take the American Olympic track team and send it throughout the world. Their tour would be of benefit in creating good will of people toward our country. I am not so sure that sending a few of our eccentric artists or characters from the entertainment world around other parts of the world at Government expense is helpful to the image that we want people to have of the United States. I merely point that out as a constructive thought.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I think there is room for debate about certain art exhibitions—I mean by that the theater arts and so on. I would say to the gentleman that we did put in the report the expression that the committee understands that when these are sent abroad the only expense the Government would pay would be the difference between the official fees and what it actually cost to send them. In other words, we are not going to subsidize them and have them make a lot of gravy on the side.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out on page 16 of the committee report the language wherein there is discussed the Immigration Act amendments. During the 3 years that I have served in the Congress, I have been requested on four occasions to introduce private bills to keep in this country doctors who have come from abroad, studied in American schools, and then decided they did not wish to go back to their native lands. I can understand if a man reaches this country and studies, for example, English, and then is offered a job as a professor teaching history in this country at one of the outstanding universities—I say this is fine, and he should stay here. But if he gets admitted into this country and we educate him in the humanitarian sciences such as medicine, dentistry, and

so forth, I think we should write into the law sufficient safeguards so that he does return to his country and works in his particular field.

I see, for example, according to the committee report, that students from the Philippines, Iran, and Turkey go to Canada to serve their 2-year period rather than return to the United States.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. The matter the gentleman mentions is adequately dealt with in this bill. The language employed was recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary for the purpose of eliminating the evasions of obligation to serve the basic aims of the program. The language of section 109 of this bill is consistent with the basic Immigration and Nationality Act. Under it an exchange student cannot have his immigration status adjusted, he cannot become a permanent resident until after he had returned to his own land and remained there for a period of 2 years thus complying with what we believe is his obligation freely assumed when he accepted assistance in order to come and study in this country. If he goes to some other land instead, this Government will determine, before readmitting him, whether that has served the purpose of the bill before us.

Religion in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Dr. R. Richard Renner, gave a very interesting talk before the annual pilgrimage of Religious Heritage of America which was held in Washington this year on June 22.

Under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting Dr. Renner's address in the RECORD, believing my colleagues will enjoy reading it as much as I did:

RELIGION IN RUSSIA

(Address delivered by R. Richard Renner, M.D., a report to the Religious Heritage of America at the annual meeting, June 22, 1961, Washington, D.C.)

We, Mrs. Renner and I, feel honored at this time to give to the Religious Heritage of America our report of the World Peace Mission to Russia. We thank you for your confidence in appointing us as official delegates of the Religious Heritage. On our way we first stopped to counsel with the outstanding peace leaders of Britain, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and West and East Germany. Everyone thought peace the most important problem before the civilized world today. And everyone thought that only one-tenth of 1 percent of the moral and spiritual leaders of the world are really doing anything personal for the cause of peace. The rest of the religious people are complacently trusting their governments to take care of the peaceful solutions of the world's govern-

mental, ideological conflicts, which, according to our preparation and spending will sooner or later lead to war as the final total settlement of the conflict.

We were personally warned by our friends of the dangers of such a mission especially in the light of the Berlin crisis about to come to a head in 1959. Even close relatives doubted the wisdom of the trip and when it came time for the final briefing by a representative from our State Department on how to act and what to do, we found that a large percentage of the delegates had decided because of the Berlin trouble not to risk the trip. There were only 12 of us.

While the plans had been perfected more by the Baptists than any other church group, we personally carried letters of introduction from our brotherhood to Dr. Zidkhov, head of the Baptist Christian Churches in Russia, inviting him and delegates of the church to come to America and especially to church conventions the following year in Scotland. We are happy to say that two delegates came and took an active part in the World Convention of Christian Churches last year in Edinburgh.

Our first encounter with the people behind the so-called Iron Curtain came in Berlin. We transferred to a different bus at the Brandenburg Gate. The East Berlin people had sent an interpreter and a noted historian, Dr. Beck, to meet us there and show us the city. East Berlin still shows the terrible destruction wrought by the American Air Force. Hitler's Reichstag is left not one stone on another, and Hitler's bombproof shelter with its six layers of concrete reinforced by steel rails is nothing but a hole in the ground with the protecting tower toppled on its side. Where there was hustle and bustle and much store and window shopping in West Berlin, the streets are much more quiet and almost deserted in East Berlin. True, they have completely rebuilt Unter den Linden, now renamed Stalin Allee. For over 2 miles the beautiful wide street is now lined with new apartment buildings with some stores on the main floors.

There is a Russian monument west of the Brandenburg Gate with two Russian soldiers guarding the first tank and the first large cannon to arrive in Berlin. But this was small compared to the large Russian Memorial Cemetery in East Berlin where 600,000 Russians who died in the march on Berlin lie buried. Here were Russian soldiers on guard as at the Tomb of our Unknown Soldier. I found out the monuments were made out of the stones from the Reichstag which permitted me to understand more why Hitler's final headquarters is now only a mass of weeds and rubble.

After the tour, we were taken to the Newa Hotel where a group from the Department of Education, Welfare, and Peace entertained us with a regular banquet. They all seemed very sincere and were anxious to document many things about the rearming of West Germany to which they strongly objected. We were all permitted to have our say. Some of our group were determined to let them know how much superior democracy is to communism. It was all very friendly and in the end someone proposed a toast to peace saying how much better it would be if our governments could meet around a common table and freely discuss the problems of world peace.

We had to be at the East Berlin airport at 7 a.m. the next morning so we could all get clearance for the 8 a.m. plane for Moscow. At 9:30 we were told the plane would be delayed and they gave us some breakfast. After lunch we finally got through the gates and were on our way.

At Vilnius we ran into the worst storm I have ever experienced in an airplane. The stewardess took the pilot up a little extra bracer but we did not fasten seat belts or

anything. Here at Vilnius we had dinner and filled out papers concerning our money and our lack of hashish and other narcotic drugs. About 11:30 p.m. we arrived in Moscow. The airport was literally crowded with people sitting or lying on the floor. Eventually, a bus came for us, and coming in over the country roads I was surprised that the driver used only his dim lights all the way. He turned his bright lights on only in passing cars and at intersections. This is the custom in much of central Europe for night driving.

Soon we entered the city and passed long rows of apartment buildings all about the same—seven or eight stories in height on either side. Eventually, after midnight we arrived at the Leningradskaya Hotel. It was a big new skyscraper building. Inside were marble pillars and stairways, red velvet carpets, huge chandeliers and everything magnificent. Soon we were up in our room where we found everything very ornate; fine linens on the beds; a large round table with a linen tablecloth; a sort of anteroom with a pretty sofa and easy chairs and with a large modern all-tile bathroom and large coat closets. This was their second best hotel built in 1953 near the four depots on Komsomolska Square and it certainly made a good impression on us.

The next morning on our way to breakfast we met Carl Sandburg, there to help open the American Exposition. After breakfast in the ornate dining room I went out and stood in front of our hotel overlooking the public square just to study the Russians. People were hurrying to and from the subway, the four railway stations and the suburban trains. After some considerable study I formulated in my mind the striking difference between the Russian and American women. The Russian women wore bubushkas mostly instead of hats. The hair, even though combed, did not have all the pretty "wrinkles" and curls like the American women. The lips and the cheeks were unpainted. The clothes were mostly of one color. The skirts were all much longer. The shoes were all black, without the high heels, and the stockings were also black and coarse like grandmother used to wear.

The men wore caps, berets or old hats, tunics with some jackets and their pants were not well pressed at all like American pants are. Many carried baggage. The women all did their fair share. Some carried over their shoulders bags made of string netting through which you could see bread, crackers, fruit, vegetables and other articles bought at the store. Nothing came in cans or in paper packages. Old newspapers, sacks and cigarette packages were not used. That made the job of the women with large witches' brooms cleaning the entire street on our side of the square much easier. You never see rubbish or litter of any kind in the wide clean streets in Russia, thanks partly to the women with the brooms and partly to the fact that there is nothing with which to litter the streets.

I thought as I studied the people that I could see there a far away sad look in their faces. No one else mentioned this. I was perhaps giving way to imagination for we often read into people's faces as well as their minds that which is mirrored back from our own minds.

The people from the Moscow-Leningrad area go south to the Urals and the Black Sea for their vacations, but all the rest of the Russian people come to Moscow and Leningrad. That is why we had opportunity to meet people from many different states. One couple we met at the puppet show had traveled 7 days and nights from Omsk, Siberia, where the man was manager of a cooperative farm. They both spoke good English. They were delightful people. We met many, at the permanent Russian Exposition and in the Kremlin Gardens, from the Uzbek and other republics. Not

once did we come in contact with any person who was mean or unfriendly to us.

The line was four abreast, about one-half mile long, waiting to get into the Lenin-Stalin Mausoleum. Our guide took us to the head of the line, but no one seemed to resent it. Down in that cold red granite tomb I studied the two perfectly preserved men who, in all-glass coffins, would seem to be still alive. There was no sign of any wrinkle in the skin, discoloration or other change you would expect even in the perfectly embalmed body. The only bodies I had seen to compare with these were in Madame Toussaud's Wax Works in London. Therefore, one wonders if these are not wax reproductions of Lenin and Stalin and the tomb is kept cold at all times to prevent the wax from melting.

That night at the circus everything was in one ring. Ed Sullivan was there with the President of the Eastman Kodak Co. We saw many acts that might fit well on the "Sullivan Show." But I was surprised at the second half when they let down from overhead enough water to fill the entire ring and the last half was a water show with tigers swimming around in that water doing some simple stunts.

At the permanent Russian Exposition there were large beautiful buildings representing each different Soviet Republic. Inside each building were shown the farm and manufactured products of each republic. Outside were beautiful fountains and all in all it made me wish that somewhere America had a place where each State could show visual evidence of its achievements.

We had visited the Russian Exposition in the Coliseum in New York and naturally made comparisons at the American Exposition in Moscow. It did not seem to me that a great number of our ultramodern paintings was appropriate for the average Russian. As I watched the faces of some of the Russians, it seemed to me they were wondering about the American mind and our sense of the beautiful. The "Family of Man" exhibit, showing the origin from prehistoric times, was puzzling to me as well as to the Russians. An American exposition ought to show things common to America and not what probably was the condition of man 10,000 to 50,000 years ago. The most crowded part of the American Exposition was the auto show, which you could not get near, for the mass of people wanting to closely inspect those new Fords, Plymouths, and Chevrolets.

Our visit to Zagorsk, the famous seminary for training of Orthodox priests, was most enjoyable. This seminary, located 50 miles north and founded in 1920, has never been shut down and continued to train priests all during the revolution. Monk Paul, whose picture was in Life magazine, was the one to show us through the educational part of the seminary. There were many beautiful churches. Some of the turnip-shaped cupolas on top were covered with gold leaf and some were a deep blue with gold decorations. Many people of the town came for the noon services. At that time I slipped out of the fortress-like walls of the seminary grounds to explore and was able to get pictures wherever desired on the back streets and the poorer parts of the city. Outside of the numerous television aerials, even over the poorest unpainted houses, the unpaved back streets and alleys with the dirt sidewalks and community wells with women carrying water two or three blocks was about what we had in many of our smaller villages several generations ago.

Along the way we had seen several "living" churches, those where services were being held regularly. The larger ones that could not support themselves were made into museums and obviously thought of as "dead" churches. However, in these museum churches I noticed people still bowed and crossed themselves before the statues and

ikons showing there is still much religious faith in Russia.

We visited one day the home of the Metropolitan Nicolai or as we would say, the topman or head of all the Orthodox churches in Moscow. He spoke to us in English and tried to make us welcome; telling us much about the present-day status of the church. Later, there was a nice reception in the gardens for us. The next morning at his church I was surprised to find the sanctuary filled to overflowing. There were no seats. Everybody stood for the 2-hour services. There was wonderful singing by the choir without benefit of organ or other musical instrument. The Metropolitan Nicolai had many assistants to help him with his different robes, vestments, and head crowns. The procession had worked its way to the back of the church, when I noticed an open side door near me. I stepped out into the sunlight and looked around for some interesting things for the movies.

Across the street were many people going in and out of a building. On closer examination I found it was a shoe store. The people came in, went over to a clerk, showed a card, then went back to the racks of all black shoes stored on shelves all down the middle of the room. The women's shoes were little different from the men's. After they had handled the proper size shoes, they measured them beside their feet, maybe tried another pair, and then carried them back to the clerk who flipped one unit of the abacus. They then put the shoes in the net bag and left the store. No time was wasted trying on the shoes because there was not a single chair in the store. It had our self-serve stores beaten in every way.

But, I wondered and began to ask about the Sunday closing laws. Slowly I learned everybody works on Sunday; they do their shopping on Sunday for the weekend and Monday is the day of rest.

This accounted for the fact that most of the people in the churches were old people. While they do not openly stop church attendance they discourage it by keeping up all business as usual on Sunday and having Monday of each week as the day off. This was obviously a left-handed slap at the church to prevent attendance. It was the Government's way of telling the people that nothing, not even their religion or their God must come between them and their work. This was striking at religion "below the belt."

When I arrived back at the church, here was our group outside ready to go over to the Baptist Church. But three women had followed the group out saying the Metropolitan was worried about us leaving for fear something was wrong. We tried to explain that the Baptist Christian group was expecting us over at their second service. We finally compromised and some of our leaders stayed at the Orthodox Church while the rest of us went across part of the city to the Baptist Christian Church.

It had become expedient after the war for all the Protestant groups to be united in one church because of lack of building space for meeting houses. The Baptists being the predominant group have their name first but its official name is Baptist-Christian. Here we found ushers waiting to take us to seats in the balcony where we could look over the entire sanctuary. It is hard to believe but even in the aisles and across the front and back, people were standing. There were some younger people in the audience and a good proportion in the choir. Dr. Zidkhov was preaching an expository sermon when we arrived. When the services were over the people shook our hands and we felt the sincerity of their welcome. In the private conference following, we delivered our personal letter to Dr. Zidkhov. Assistants trained in England were good interpreters. There is no place in Russia to train other than Orthodox ministers. In

the conference we learned that their greatest need was for Bibles printed in the Russian language. Since the Government there controlled the presses and would not permit the printing of Bibles, they hoped we could get some from the American Bible Society and mail them without any outside markers, simply as gift books, addressed to their private homes.

There had been on earlier Sunday service and there were to be three more with only an hour between so we had to part with these kind people. But all of us were convinced that morning, that in spite of any godless government, religion is not now dead nor even dying in Russia.

Our next religious trip was to the home of Tolstol, about 150 miles south of the city. We got a faster bus but it still took 5 hours. The little country homes in the little towns along the way with the common well and the women washing clothes along the edge of the brook reminded me of travel through the Indian villages of Mexico. There were no gas stations or Howard Johnson restaurants anywhere and the only comfort station was a woods about half way along where the bus stopped and the men and women disappeared in two different directions.

Beyond the city of Tula is the large former estate of Leo Tolstol. His home containing the library and other relics is lovingly preserved and cared for. I gained a great respect for the man and decided to study his life in detail as soon as I had opportunity.

Next, we went to see his grave. I expected to see a large monument in the local cemetery to this great man of Russia and one of the greatest authors the world has ever known. We were led along a winding path about a third of a mile into the woods behind the home. There, in the deep woods on his estate, with no monument or Orthodox cross, no headstone of any kind, is the lonely grave with some white flowers growing upon it. We learned he could not be buried from any church, nor have his final resting place in any cemetery. He could not have a priest, let alone any Metropolitan Nicolai, all because he had taught that serfdom was wrong; that men should not be in bondage 3 days a week to the government of the Czars, but should be educated; they should be nonviolent; they should avoid conscription and military service; they should avoid intoxicants, drugs and tobacco. People should share their wealth, give up their monopoly, end serfdom and all forms of war and military service. You might readily see why this teaching would turn the Government against him and cause many of his followers to be banished to Siberia. But why would teaching like this turn the church against him when it would seem to be in line with the teachings of Christ?

It is hard to understand until we study and realize that the state, the Government and the church were one. The Czar was head of the Russian Orthodox Church. The Government gave complete financial support to the church. Therefore, the church gave complete moral, spiritual and political support to the Government. And when Tolstol offended the Government he doubly offended the church. Standing there in the deep shade of the forest I gave a silent prayer of thanks for the heritage of America, wherein our wise forefathers planned and tried to make certain and final the complete and total permanent separation of state and church in this beloved land.

Our experiences with the people were very much the same in Leningrad as in Moscow. I took movies and we went around by ourselves in the evenings whenever we knew where we wanted to go and thought we could get back without getting lost. St. Isaac's most beautiful cathedral is now a museum and swinging from this third highest church dome in the world is a Foucault

pendulum, proving scientifically that the earth rotates on its axis. People still cross themselves at all the holy places in front of the beautiful ikons. It is perfectly logical to know these enormous cathedrals could not be supported and maintained by free will offerings and naturally the government could solve the problem by converting them into public museums.

I would like to tell you about the one, Kazan Cathedral, converted into an anti-religious museum, showing in many ways the horrors of the inquisition, the rack, the burning at the stake, the massacres on St. Bartholomew's Day and the many crimes which we admit were committed in the name of religion. These crimes helped drive religious people to America which is the only good thing I can say about them. I have tried to point out that these crimes were committed mostly by the state when the church and state were one. Just because a government commits a crime in the name of religion and with the consent of so-called religious people does not make it any less a duty of every Christian to see that his religion is never dependent on political or financial support of any government. In this connection I would like to point out that the crucifixion of Christ was a crime committed by the government under the sanction and in the name of religion.

We were greatly impressed by the summer palaces of the czars and the 600 fountains at Peterhof on the Gulf of Finland. The czar went to Versailles and came back to make a park more wonderful and impressive. I believe he did. Water comes down from the mountains over 200 miles away to keep the fountains going night and day. Many women are busy keeping the grounds perfect. The summer palaces are beautifully restored on the outside but on the inside they are still a shambles because it was here the German Army was quartered during the 900-day siege of Leningrad which was completely surrounded that entire time. Over 1 million people starved to death in that period. The only lifeline was over the frozen Lake Ladoga in the dead of winter. And it seems to be a fact that Russia lost over 20 million people, killed or starved to death during the war. This bad news was kept from the Russian people during the war to prevent them from becoming discouraged. This might give America some idea of how much help Russia was to us in winning World War II when some authorities tell us they suffered 80 times as many casualties as we did.

At the Baptist Church in Leningrad they were repairing the front of the church. We entered from the rear and were immediately ushered up to the very front row. The assistant pastor came down and asked me about our world peace mission. He announced to the whole audience what I had told him. There were two different moderately short sermons. In English we were welcomed. They too had hoped we were bringing Bibles. But their desire for peace seemed sincere to us. At the conclusion, we sang with them "God Be With You 'Till We Meet Again." I looked back. They were waving their white handkerchiefs above their heads and tears were streaming down the cheeks of many of those people.

At the Hermitage Art Galleries I could hardly believe my own eyes. It was the big Palace of the Czars filled with the most costly original art treasures of all the world. Catherine the Great gets credit for accumulating most of these treasures. Where she got the money to buy them would be a mystery to any thinking person. There were few guards as we spent most of the day going from one big beautiful room to another. Some say the Hermitage is second to the Louvre in Paris and the National Gallery in London. The settings and the surroundings made a great impression on me and I would call the Hermitage

second to none. However, that is not the voice of authority for art is not my specialty.

Near here is Revolution Square and the famous gate where the people poured through on November 9, 1917, with the slogans on their lips of "Peace and land for the peasants" and "Peace and bread for the workmen." It was here that I asked "What caused this sudden revolution in the first place?" Oh, it was not sudden," I was told. It had been coming on for over a half century and was all due to the autocracy of the Czars and the ruling nobility and their suppression of the peasants and working people who were unable to own their own land and had to work 3 days a week for the Czars. In 1859 when Tolstol first began to write against serfdom there were over 23 million bound to the soil with no civil rights and always bound in debt owing heavy dues and services to their lords.

Czar Alexander II was forced to start freeing these people in 1861. He would probably have made more reforms but he was assassinated in 1881. As the new Czar Alexander III came to the throne he received a letter from the opposition, protesting crimes of the government and ending up as follows: "Revolutionists are the creation of circumstances; of the general discontent of the people; of the striving of Russia after a new social framework. It is impossible, by means of repression to stifle discontent. Discontent only grows the more when it is repressed." But Alexander III only repressed the people more and more. As the world industrial revolution began to affect Russia, the power and discontent of the lower and middle classes grew.

Son Nicholas II became Czar in 1894. He had less intellect and less character than his father. He gave the fierce Cossacks and the secret police full power to deal with the revolutionary societies in any way they desired. The Russo-Japanese War was expected to unite the people against Japan but even war failed to make the people forget their sad condition and they blamed the Czar's regime for the defeat.

On January 22, 1905, a priest named Father Gapon on this Sunday led an enormous crowd with a petition to the czar at the winter palace in St. Petersburg. The petition in part declared: "We workers—have come to you, sire, in search of justice and protection. We have fallen into poverty; we are oppressed; we are loaded with a crushing burden of toll; we are insulted; we are not recognized as men; we are treated as slaves who should bear their sad and bitter lot in patience and silence. Do not refuse to protect your people; raise it from the grave of arbitrary power, poverty, and ignorance; permit it to dispose of its own fate; free it from the intolerable oppression of officials; destroy the wall between yourself and your people—and let them govern the country with you."

Before they got near the czar, just as they approached the palace the waiting Cossack guards opened fire on this defenseless crowd, killing many and wounding more.

The London Times correspondent described this as "the most horrible spectacle ever witnessed." Blood flowed in streams on the hardened snow. Police slashed blindly at the crowd. They used their revolvers and whole companies of infantry "discharged murderous volleys on the shrieking crowd. Women and children covered with blood fell wounded over the dead in the cold snow. This is not a strike. It is a revolution."

As a result of this Red Sunday massacre a general strike was called. Russia was paralyzed. The Orthodox church, long the bulwark of autocracy, tried this appeal to the people: "Workers of Russia, children of toil. Work, according to God's Word, with the sweat of your brow and remember that he who will not work, neither shall he eat."

Beware of false counselors who, pretending anxiety over your needs and well-being foment disorders which lose you your homes and your food. They are the lesser agents of the evil enemy who desires the destruction of Russia."

This revolution of 1905 eventually failed due to the military power of the czar and the supporting power of the Orthodox church. Many people were hanged and many were deported to Siberia. While the Russian Revolution was driven underground, do you wonder that it would disrupt again when Russia was torn asunder by World War I and that because the Orthodox church, being supported by autocracy and supporting the czars, would be considered as a factor that must have no part in the new government of 1917? No part of the Bolshevik policy has received more criticism than their treatment of the Orthodox church. But the Orthodox church was partly to blame because of their complete subordination to the czars. It was only natural that the new government would deprive the church of its powers over education.

But it goes deeper than that for the Communist Party is intensely jealous of religion and thinks the individual should have no loyalty except to the state. That is why attendance at divine services was forbidden to party members. Religion could not be taught to anyone under 18 except in the home. No religious activity was permitted except worship. Anti-religious teaching was stressed and many churches were made into museums. Our guide was willing to argue with me and openly declared she could not see how I could be a scientific practitioner of medicine and still believe in God.

The pendulum that swung so far against religion under Stalin is now swinging back slightly under Mr. Khrushchev. They have learned that religion is not stamped out by law. The Jews have a nice synagogue in Moscow and Leningrad. For the Moslems in Leningrad there is an exact replica of the tomb of Tamerlane in Samarkand, a most beautiful mosque. Tolerance of minorities is increasing and well it should be, for some day the religious people of Russia will awake to the fact that the whole Communist Party is about the least minority of any group in Russia (1 to 2 percent) even if it at present is the most powerful. And no small minority can forever rule the great majority when that majority becomes aware of its own power.

In conclusion, it would be my impression that we in America should remember that:

1. The Communist regime represents approximately only 2 percent of the Russian people.
2. The Russian people are better off now than they were under the czars.
3. The Russian people are friendly and would like to be friends of America.
4. The Russian Government has been able to instill in them some fear but no hate for America.
5. The antireligion in the present Government is due to the fact that the Orthodox Church was part and parcel of the hated czarist autocratic government.
6. The pendulum always swings too far in times of revolution and even now the pendulum in Russia is swinging back to the side of religious freedom.
7. America should be strong at home but not flaunt its military power over all the world to make people think they personally are in danger of our wrath.
8. We should keep up more religious, spiritual, and cultural contact with the Russian people.
9. We should invite delegations of Russians to come to America to visit our churches as well as our farms and factories.

10. We should remember Russia fought on our side in World War II as well as World War I. Russia lost 20 million people in World War II and still has a genuine fear of a reunited Germany. It is time now to end World War II with a peace treaty and thus end the cold war. America should take the lead in peace and send our Peace Corps to Russia as well as to the rest of the world.

Satellite Communications System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am presenting an article from the September 11, 1961, issue of the New Republic which is entitled "Enterprise in Space." Because this subject is so very timely, I want to call it to the special attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

ENTERPRISE IN SPACE

The debate over the ownership of the unborn communications satellite system continues. Thirty-five Members of Congress wrote to the President on August 14 warning that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. would get "very probably a monopoly position" under the administration policy placing the system in the hands of private enterprise—with Government participation limited to the provision of ground support where necessary.

Many assume that a resource of such potential usefulness should be owned and operated by the same Federal Government which has already poured so much of the people's money into its development. But the problem is more complex than this. Public operation is not necessarily the best approach to the management of a technology that has the fluid and experimental character of space communications at the present time. There are reasons to believe that the practical application of this technology will be facilitated by integrating it with existing international communications systems.

When the Federal Communications Commission invited 10 U.S. international communications concerns in the telephone and telegraph business to form a committee and determine how much capital each of them would put up to launch the proposed space communications industry, only four, according to recent press reports, have shown interest. They are troubled, among other things, by the requirements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration that the system should be inaugurated on what amounts to a crash basis, that is, at the earliest possible time; that global coverage should be provided even to unprofitable areas and that they may be called on to put up as much as \$400 million. They are also bothered, in all probability, by the requirement that the participating companies shall refrain from managing the system to the detriment of any other common carrier of long-distance radiotelephone or TV services.

In 1960 overseas telephone calls increased 20 percent. Indeed, the growth of demand in the industry is so great that this alone could justify the outlay needed to develop a satellite communication system. Here we have a clue to the unannounced reason why

the administration has limited the initial participation to firms already in the business. It is they who are pressed by this demand and can be expected to contribute the risk capital needed now. And the risks are great, even when shared between Government and industry. On the basis of the record fully half of all future satellite launchings will fail. Whether the rocket vehicle carrying the satellite goes the whole way up or not, the cost of shooting one is \$6 million, and the cost of the communication satellite in the nose of it \$3 million or more, depending on the type. The cost of a single working space satellite may well be, then, twice the sum of these figures. While theoretically, a limited service could be furnished by three satellites, if a truly global and reliable system is desired (and that is what the President asked for) as many as 50 may be required.

At the present time the working life of these satellites is unknown, which means that it is impossible to calculate the replacement factor and set up amortization schedules, as in any normal business. Further, most of the communications satellites now under development must be oriented or rotated to face the ground stations which they are to serve. This adjustment can be made by radio signals from below, or should the receiving apparatus in the satellite be locked onto a coded signal to prevent mischievous people from sending a signal that will instruct that dumb hunk of mechanism to turn the wrong way around? If so, this may introduce still more extra cost as well as an element of potential unreliability. Moreover, one can only orient communications satellites toward ground stations that already exist, that is, toward actual radio and wired telephone systems. Clearly, it will be anything but roses, roses all the way for the companies, who may be asked to install expensive ground equipment in underdeveloped countries which possess no well-developed communications network to receive input from the international satellite system. President Kennedy has conditioned private operation of the system on the provision of facilities to all countries—including the less developed.

The various national communications systems that function today are owned and managed by Government departments, or Government corporations, or Government-regulated (private) companies. They have developed agreements that have worked without a hitch through war and peace; this is one area that continues to be unaffected by politics, or even the cold war. Management of an international space communication system could be adjusted, probably without trouble, between the parties involved in the present disagreements. But this does not dispose of the domestic hobgoblin of monopoly. For there is no escape from the fact that a small group of companies, or one supercorporation, may dominate the new development.

What we are confronted with is a clash between broad social policy and, in this case, immediate efficiency. Nobody can claim that any small- or medium-sized business has an industrial research capability remotely resembling that of the Bell Laboratories, a subsidiary of A.T. & T. In fact, Bell is regarded as the best setup of its kind in the Western World. Out of it have come many of the basic developments that make communications satellite technology feasible: the transistor, the solar battery, the traveling wave tube, and the ruby red maser. This too is where space communications satellites have been in development for a long time; as far back as 1955, John R. Pierce, now director of research at the laboratories, published a paper in which he discussed the various types of satellite radio repeaters which are under consideration today. In

many cases involving highly experimental technology the question appears to be not so much whether Government should supplant big business, but whether Government can, in fact, exercise control over big business in the public interest. Those who pose the question in traditional antimonopoly terms should remember that it is the need to exert such control which provides the fundamental justification for big government.

New Dimensions in U.S. International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of many people, both in the United States and abroad, the Peace Corps is a new frontier. As a secular missionary program, the Peace Corps appeals to the American tradition of unselfish service, which persists even in the absence of denominational religious motivation. The idea of personal service to individuals in other countries is a simple, strong, and appealing concept.

I was extremely pleased to note that two Delawareans have been selected for service abroad in the Peace Corps program. In a personal visit to my office on August 29, Mr. Jacob Feldman, of Wilmington, Del., explained to me his preliminary training at Texas Western College in El Paso, Tex., prior to his immediate assignment to further training at the Peace Corps Training Center in Puerto Rico for the Tanganyika project.

Mr. Feldman will undoubtedly meet another Delawarean, Peace Corps Volunteer Thomas J. Kincaid, of Seaford, Del., at the Puerto Rico Training Center. Mr. Kincaid has been accepted for formal training next month at Pennsylvania State University in preparation for the Philippines project.

I know that Delawareans join with me in extending good wishes to Peace Corpsmen Feldman and Kincaid in this new and bold dimension in American mutual assistance programs.

While Peace Corps volunteers will provide international communications on a person-to-person level, advice and guidance to governments of many countries is also offered under the aegis of other U.S. foreign assistance programs.

I am especially proud of another Delawarean who is making outstanding contributions in efforts by the United States to increase the welfare of men and improve understanding among nations.

I am privileged at this time to recognize the commendable public services of Mr. Charles David Crocker, of Frankford, Del. A 1938 graduate and Phi Kappa Phi of the University of Delaware, Mr. Crocker served with distinction in the U.S. Navy in the Pacific during World War II. Prior to his current assignment with the U.S. Operations Mission in Cambodia, Mr. Crocker served

as a soil conservation specialist in Korea from July 1957 to February 1961.

The high regard for Mr. Crocker's work held by those who observed him at close range, was reported several months ago in the Korean press. Beyond the news article, which I shall include as part of my remarks hereinbelow, I would like to point to an uncommon act of benevolence on Mr. Crocker's part in his assignments overseas. While serving in Korea, Mr. Crocker donated 4,560 grams of blood for Korean patients; for this humanitarian conduct he was awarded a Medal of Merit by the Korean Red Cross. Since his arrival in Cambodia last February, Mr. Crocker has made regular contributions as a donor to local hospital blood banks in that country.

In addition to his formal duties in Cambodia, Mr. Crocker is a lay reader for the Anglican-Episcopalian congregation at Phnom-Penh. I have been informed that this congregation is also visited monthly by Rev. Dr. Welden Pell III, who now lives and serves in Saigon; Delawareans will remember Reverend Pell as the former headmaster of the St. Andrews School in Middletown, Del.

There are many Americans who, unlike those able Delawareans cited above, regard citizenship as sinecure, who fear involvement and shun personal commitments but, nevertheless, reserve the right to criticize. There are those citizens who still avoid the many unique opportunities for helpful action offered to us at this period in our history when our Nation has become a world leader.

Two leading principles of conduct which moved the Founding Fathers were: do your part and do your best. It is in this great tradition that Messrs. Feldman, Kincaid, and Crocker have taken their stand and they are conducting themselves in ways which give our foreign policy new and dynamic dimensions. Their contributions are, indeed, welcome and they are in the direction of the kind of help which will effectively overcome the kind of criticism reported in "The Ugly American."

I include a news report on Mr. Crocker's Korean assignment which was published in the Korean Republic newspaper on January 19, 1961:

SOIL ADVISER HELPS TO KEEP COUNTRY GREEN
(By W. G. Beck)

A handsome, tall American has taught Koreans how to make and keep their country green.

Charles D. Crocker, of Frankford, Del., has set up a land management program to arrest land erosion, reforest barren hills, bring new areas under cultivation, and reduce flood damage.

A graduate of the University of Delaware, Crocker worked as soil adviser with the U.S. Operations Mission in Korea.

Because of the mountainous terrain, the 16 million farming populace of Korea have depended on the very small level parts of the country for farming. Erosion losses have been enormous and inadequate use and poor management of land have been tragically common.

Crocker exercised leadership in cooperation with ROK officials in setting up a momentous program to protect land and boost the productivity of upland farms.

The program brought reforestation, conservation, and proper land use to some 11,000

acres in 1958, 50,000 in 1959, and 460,000 in 1960.

In assisting the Korean Government in drawing up and initiating this mountain land conservation program, he has conducted training of more than 1,000 technicians and officials in 38 demonstration areas, and at several agricultural institutions in the country.

He assisted the ROK Government Bureau of Forestry in setting up 140 conservation demonstration villages, one in each county, and worked through 49 forest erosion control stations, assisting the forestry bureau with its 10-year program to rehabilitate denuded forest areas and to improve production from the hill lands.

He trained Koreans in land classification on the basis of soil production capability. Attempts were being made to farm some land with little value except for forest land, and a great deal of potentially good farm land was classed as forest land. Maps based on land capability surveys change these classifications to more appropriate productive use.

For example, extensive areas can be used for raising grass and important nitrogen-producing legumes. Crops like hairy vetch and lespedeza can be raised in relatively poor land which is used in highly productive areas to reduce fertilizer costs. Other lands can be used to produce more chestnuts, walnuts, orchard fruits, and mulberry for silk production.

He also trained Koreans in making the necessary adjustments in land use and in developing a sense of land stewardship on the part of Korean villagers.

He promoted democratic, local, self-determination of conservation measures and self-help operation of the conservation program. He accomplished this by starting freely elected village conservation committees as the bodies for carrying out the program.

When, for the first time outside the Western Hemisphere, a chapter of the Soil Conservation Society of America was organized in Korea, he was the organizer and first chairman.

Crocker, after 3½ years of service in Korea, leaves Korea shortly for a new post in Cambodia.

Construction of Transmission Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am presenting an item from the editorial page of the Washington Post of September 9, 1961, containing comments from one of my constituents, President D. W. Reeves, Public Service Co. of New Mexico, in Albuquerque. My presentation of this news item does not necessarily mean that it represents my viewpoint concerning the transmission line question.

The item follows:

WHO SHOULD OWN THE GRID?

On August 23, you published a letter from Mr. Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary of the Interior. The letter poses a question of importance to the American people far surmounting that of constructing a transmission system in the Rocky Mountain States areas.

First, the investor-owned companies in the Rocky Mountain States have actively supported and will continue to support the irrigation and reclamation features of the Colorado River storage project as well as any other true irrigation or reclamation project. We realize the importance of water in the Rocky Mountain West and we appreciate the support of other sections of the Nation for necessary reclamation projects.

The Bureau of Reclamation, which is under Mr. Holum's direction, proposes to build an all-Federal transmission system for the distribution of power from the Colorado River Storage project hydroelectric generating plants to deliver power to preferred Government customers in the five-State area of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. The five investor-owned electric companies, who are now serving this area, recommended the Government construct only certain transmission lines and use the company lines for distributing power to Government customers.

Congress, at the time the Colorado River storage project was authorized, specifically noted that the power features of the project were incidental to the primary objective of irrigation and reclamation. Congress further directed the Bureau to cooperate with the private utilities in the area, and to use the existing and planned transmission lines of the private companies to market project power.

As a result of exhaustive studies, and in accordance with congressional instruction, the utilities proposed a combination Federal-private transmission system in which the Bureau would build certain transmission lines and utilize the existing and planned transmission lines of the companies to deliver power to the preferred Government customers. Under the utility proposal the Federal expenditure would be approximately \$53 million. Under the all-Federal system, as proposed by the Bureau, the Federal expenditure would be about \$188 million, a difference of \$135 million which must be repaid with interest to the Federal Treasury.

All of Mr. Holum's arguments, such as interconnections with other Federal systems, rights of preferred Federal customers, control of the Federal system, and many more, have been fully discussed before congressional committees and the Bureau has agreed that the combination system, as proposed by the utility companies, meets all but one of their requirements.

The only requirement which the Bureau doubts is the amount of payout. Competent engineering and economic studies show that the combination Federal-private system will, in a shorter period of time, provide the most revenue to repay the cost of electric facilities; and provide the most revenue for authorized and planned irrigation and reclamation projects—all this without increase in the cost of power to the preferred Federal customers.

If the Government assumes responsibility for transmission with the proposed all-Federal system, what will happen as the preferred customers' requirements increase? With an all-Federal system many additional miles of transmission lines will be required to deliver power to the Government's customers. Who is going to build these lines? It would be the REA with 2-percent Government money. Who is going to build steam generating plants to firm up the Government's hydroelectric power? Already we hear G. & T. Cooperatives are planning construction of steamplants to carry out this responsibility. This would, of course, be financed with additional millions of 2-percent REA money. The \$188 million required for the Colorado River storage project is just the beginning. More hundreds of millions would be required from the Federal Treasury before the proposed plan is fully consummated.

Mr. Holum says that "a backbone Federal system and interconnection with other public systems is essential to such an operation." It is not essential or even necessary to the marketing of Colorado River storage project power. It is only essential to the establishment of a nationwide Federal power grid system. The entire job of marketing all of the project power can be accomplished much better by the combination Federal-private system. The combination system will save the Government an immediate expenditure of \$135 million and untold millions of future expenditures, all without adversely affecting consumer power rates. In addition, use of company transmission lines will provide many millions of dollars in increased Federal, State, and local taxes, which when considered with direct project benefits show the overwhelming advantages of the utilities proposal.

To me, the attempt to justify the all-Federal system is an effort on the part of the proponents of political electric power, to create a national supergrid, owned and operated by the Federal Government.

D. W. REEVES,
President, Public Service Co., of New Mexico.
ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.

District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, considerable attention was focused on recent hearings of the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor on a bill which would prohibit discrimination in all types of apprenticeship programs. The statement submitted by the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council is a constructive contribution, and I believe my colleagues will find it of interest:

STATEMENT FROM THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL TO THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR INVESTIGATING DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES IN APPRENTICESHIP

The District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council is an agency of the District of Columbia government established under provisions of the Bridges-Randolph District of Columbia Apprenticeship Act of 1946.

It is composed of six members appointed by the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners from management and labor people who have had outstanding experience in the problems of training apprentices and other trainees on the job.

The three management members represent the major management organizations in the District of Columbia, and the three labor members the major labor organizations. The Council was first appointed in 1946.

1. The District of Columbia Apprenticeship office never received directives from the U.S. Department of Labor indicating objection to such notations. The council has asked for copies of such directives. So far, none have been received. If the Council had known at any time that there was objection to such designation, even when used as a confidential record, it would have discontinued the practice immediately. Though representatives of the public schools and the U.S. Employment Service have at-

tended the Council's meetings regularly, among the members of minority groups, this point was never raised.

2. The practice was discontinued by the council immediately after Mr. ROOSEVELT raised objection, and all such designations have been removed from the file. As it has been repeatedly said, the practice was instituted merely to find out what trades Negro youths were most interested in currently so that special effort could be devoted to promoting programs in these trades. We little suspected that this simple procedure would be so widely misunderstood. In fact, the Council is wondering how such information could be used for discriminatory purposes. Obviously, when an applicant appears at an employer or union office, his identity is immediately revealed.

3. The USES for the District of Columbia has been coding job orders C and W for years. We understand that since the hearing, this practice has been discontinued.

4. The U.S. Department of Labor publishes reports on workers by color. We refer to the publication Employment and Earnings, July 1961, issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which carries statistics by color in tables A-6, A-11, A-14, A-19, and table C on page 4-E. Also "Special Labor Force Report No. 14," republished by BLS from the Monthly Labor Review, April 1961, carries the following tables listing color: Tables A-4, B-5, C-7, F-4, and F-5.

5. Some District of Columbia government agencies require race information and use racial coding. The District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation distributes a list to employers and unions with the notation N and W beside the person's name. All District of Columbia drivers permits carry the coding N and W. Through 1955, U.S. Civil Service Commission Standard Form 50 (7 part) reported the person's race in item 18.

6. District of Columbia public schools regularly publish figures by color on students and dropouts. County public schools do the same.

7. No one outside of the council's office ever saw the file or knew about it. In fact, the newer council members heard a summary report on these figures, but did not know how they were compiled. The figures in summary form were reported not only at council meetings, but also at "career days," and meetings with employment and vocational counselors, youth problem conferences, the council's reports, and to agencies requesting such information.

8. To date, no one has filed a complaint with the council on racial discrimination under any programs it has approved.

9. The council's investigation reveals that Clarence E. Williams, the young man who appeared at the hearing before Mr. SIMS, has been on the IBEW Local No. 26, Joint Apprenticeship Committee's applicants list since May 12, 1961, when he submitted his high school diploma. We do not know why he did not include this information in his testimony.

10. As it was repeatedly pointed out at the hearing, Federal and local apprenticeship agencies, such as the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, or the District of Columbia Apprenticeship Council, are not placement agencies. This is the function of the U.S. Employment Service and its State counterparts.

Hereafter the council will refer all requests for information for apprenticeship openings to the Special Services to Youth Office of the USES for District of Columbia, 1724 F Street, NW. This office is not only in position to enforce all the latest U.S. Department of Labor directives against discrimination, but it also gets information on apprenticeships which are not covered by the council.

Only about 50 percent of the potential apprenticeships in the District of Columbia

area are under the council's minimum standards. The Potomac Electric Power Co., C. & P. Telephone Co., Washington Gas Light Co., and D.C. Transit have apprenticeship programs outside of the council's minimum standards. Incidentally, all of these companies have union contracts. Federal and District of Columbia government agencies also are not cooperating with the council. Also most of the hotels, large apartment houses, office buildings, hospitals, universities, and department stores, all of whom employ skilled workers in many trades, are not cooperating. But all of these establishments call on the USES for apprenticeship and trainee applicants. The council gets an average of four or five reports on openings a month, and these are all promptly reported to the USES's Special Services to Youth office.

It seems that because the council has to work with labor unions, it is guilty by association as far as certain undesirable practices are concerned. The council also works with nonunion employers, so, by association, it presumably is also guilty of whatever social sins nonunion employers are guilty of.

We are enclosing copy of the council's order No. 14, issued August 7, 1959, more than 2 years ago. We believe that this is the first time an apprenticeship or District of Columbia government agency has gone on written record against discrimination.

We are also enclosing a copy of a resolution passed by the National Association of State and Territorial Directors at its annual conference December 9, 1959, a letter Mr. Simi received from the U.S. Department of the Navy in 1943, commending him for special services rendered, and a copy of a re-

port of registered apprentices by States. It will be appreciated if this material can be printed as part of this statement. Thank you.

GOVERNMENT OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
APPRENTICESHIP COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1959.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPRENTICESHIP
COUNCIL'S ORDER NO. 14

Pursuant to authority vested in this council by the Bridges-Randolph Apprenticeship Act of 1946, Public Law 387, 79th Congress (60 Stat. 204 ch. 267) and title 36, chapter 1-A, D.C. Code, 1951; it is ordered:

That for the purposes of this act and title, and in the best interests of the council's planned apprenticeship program for the District of Columbia area, the officially declared policy of the council regarding the selection of apprentices is to recommend to and encourage employers, their agents, and apprenticeship committees with approved programs, to give first consideration to applicants who, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin, are best qualified by background, training, and natural aptitudes to develop into competent, all-around journeymen craftsmen.

This has been the basic policy of the council since it was first established in 1946. It is so self-evident and consistent with the American concept of apprenticeship that the council has not thought it necessary to further clarify it by making it a matter of written record. However, because of recent attempts to create the impression that on this point the council favors a policy of

discrimination and arbitrariness, it feels that, in the best interest of the program and the community, it should make its policy on this point a matter of public record.

Approved by the council at its 57th regular meeting, Friday, August 7, 1959, and copies ordered transmitted to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners and the District of Columbia Register.

ROBERT E. PHELPS,
Vice Chairman.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AND TERRITORIAL APPRENTICESHIP DIRECTORS

Resolution reaffirming its stand against discrimination in selecting apprentices

In line with the remarks of the Honorable Robert E. McLaughlin, president, District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, on December 8, 1959, in welcoming the 1959 annual conference of the National Association of State and Territorial Apprenticeship Directors at Washington, D.C., the association goes on record as reaffirming its traditional stand against discrimination in the selection of apprentices and again urges all employers and apprenticeship committees training apprentices under State and territorial minimum standards to give first consideration to the best qualified apprenticeship applicants on the basis of native aptitudes and intelligence, and employment and educational background, regardless of race, color, creed, ancestry, or national origin.

Approved December 9, 1959.

(NOTE.—Introduced by Gino J. Simi, District of Columbia, and seconded by Hubert L. Connor, Massachusetts, and Thomas Yoczik, Connecticut.)

TABLE 4.—Ratio of registered apprentices to population—Adopted from Wisconsin Industrial Commission Report of 1961

States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population	States and territories	Apprenticeship councils	Population (1960 census)	Apprentices Jan. 1, 1961	Ratio to population
United States.....	(1937)	179,323,175	161,128	1,112.9	27. Massachusetts.....	(1938)	5,148,578	3,881	1,326.6
1. District of Columbia.....	(1946)	763,966	2,267	336.9	28. Tennessee.....	(None)	3,567,089	2,662	1,340.0
2. Arizona.....	(1941)	1,302,161	2,582	504.3	29. North Dakota.....	(None)	632,446	462	1,368.9
3. Nevada.....	(1939)	285,278	527	540.3	30. Indiana.....	(None)	4,662,498	3,403	1,370.1
4. Connecticut.....	(1938)	2,535,234	4,358	581.7	31. Maryland.....	(None)	3,100,689	2,165	1,430.3
5. Hawaii.....	(1941)	632,772	1,054	600.3	32. New Jersey.....	(1953)	6,066,782	4,177	1,452.4
6. Washington.....	(1941)	2,853,214	4,064	702.0	33. North Carolina.....	(1939)	4,556,155	3,105	1,467.3
7. Rhode Island.....	(1942)	859,488	1,172	733.3	34. Louisiana.....	(1938)	3,257,022	2,096	1,506.2
8. California.....	(1939)	15,717,204	21,219	740.7	35. Oklahoma.....	(None)	2,325,284	1,521	1,503.7
9. Minnesota.....	(1939)	3,413,864	4,559	748.8	36. Iowa.....	(1936)	2,757,537	1,783	1,546.5
10. Oregon.....	(1931)	1,768,687	2,345	754.2	37. Pennsylvania.....	(1939)	11,319,366	7,129	1,587.7
11. Vermont.....	(1939)	389,881	513	760.0	38. Maine.....	(1942)	969,265	606	1,599.4
12. Alaska.....	(1946)	226,167	284	796.3	39. Nebraska.....	(None)	1,411,330	878	1,607.4
13. Montana.....	(1941)	674,767	838	805.2	40. Virginia.....	(1938)	3,966,949	2,467	1,608.0
14. Utah.....	(1949)	890,627	1,094	814.1	41. Idaho.....	(None)	667,191	391	1,706.3
15. Wyoming.....	(None)	330,066	378	873.1	42. Texas.....	(None)	9,579,677	5,457	1,753.6
16. Colorado.....	(1937)	1,753,947	1,939	904.5	43. Georgia.....	(None)	3,943,116	2,196	1,795.5
17. Wisconsin.....	(1911)	3,951,777	4,229	934.4	44. Arkansas.....	(None)	1,786,272	943	1,894.2
18. Ohio.....	(1939)	9,706,397	9,808	989.6	45. Kansas.....	(1941)	2,178,611	1,144	1,904.3
19. Florida.....	(1938)	4,951,560	4,967	996.8	46. South Dakota.....	(None)	680,514	356	1,911.5
20. New Mexico.....	(1945)	951,023	935	1,017.1	47. Kentucky.....	(1940)	3,038,156	1,537	1,951.9
21. New York.....	(1941)	16,782,304	16,331	1,027.6	48. Puerto Rico.....	(1947)	2,282,000	1,107	2,061.4
22. Michigan.....	(None)	7,823,194	7,366	1,062.0	49. Mississippi.....	(None)	2,178,141	1,003	2,171.6
23. Delaware.....	(None)	446,292	417	1,070.2	50. West Virginia.....	(None)	1,860,421	820	2,268.8
24. Illinois.....	(None)	10,081,158	9,183	1,097.8	51. South Carolina.....	(None)	2,382,594	878	2,713.6
25. Alabama.....	(None)	3,266,740	1,978	1,145.9	52. New Hampshire.....	(1941)	606,921	210	2,890.1
26. Missouri.....	(None)	4,319,813	3,264	1,323.4					

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1943.

Mr. GINO J. SIMI,
Field Representative, Apprentice Training
Service, War Manpower Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SIMI: This Office wishes to express its appreciation for your aid in solving the manpower problem of the Atlas Machine & Iron Works, Washington, D.C.

There is no doubt that the additional workers will contribute directly to the ability of the company to maintain its production schedules on the important Navy equipment which it is producing.

Very truly yours,

A. C. WOLF,
Lieutenant, U.S. Naval Reserve,
Manpower Utilization Unit.

(NOTE.—Succeeded in getting union to accept Negroes.)

Gen. E. Arthur Evans (Retired) Leads
Fight To Lift Restrictions on Importa-
tion of Residual Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to join in the efforts of many Members of Congress, the New England Council, the Oil Users Association, and the American Public Power Association, to have the Office of Civil and Defense

Mobilization investigate the advisability of easing its present restrictions on the importation of residual oil. The responsibility in the hands of the Director of this Office, Mr. Frank B. Ellis, is the determination of whether from the standpoint of national security, the control of residual fuel oil imports should be continued, modified, or terminated.

The deadline for filing statements in support of termination of present restrictions was July 21; the deadline for filing statements of rebuttal was August 21. All of us who are vitally interested in a healthy trade program and its beneficial effects upon the social and economic development of South America and in preserving for our citizens reasonable electricity rates, expectantly

await Mr. Ellis' decision in this matter which is vital to our Nation's security and the furtherance of this country's foreign policy goals.

At this time, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a statement issued by the Oil Users Association dealing with an address by its managing director, Gen. E. Arthur Evans. General Evans has been well known to me over a period of years. Leaving the post of executive director of the Reserve Officers Association in the early 1950's, he was chosen for the difficult and arduous position of city manager of Miami, Fla. To this challenging task, he brought tremendous energy, ability, and imagination. His 6-year tenure has gone down in the history of the city of Miami as one of the most enlightened and progressive periods since that city's emergence as one of the leading metropolitan areas of the Nation.

General Evans has made an excellent case for the 20,000-member organization he represents. The points he raises in the following news story are of equal interest to all of our citizens whose interests are involved in the impending decision of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:

"Both the consumer and the unemployed coal miner lose under the residual oil imports program. The only winners are a few privileged quota holders," said a consumer spokesman today.

Gen. E. A. Evans, managing director of a group of more than 20,000 oil users in Eastern States, spoke about the review of residual imports now being conducted by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

He said import restrictions have resulted in price increases of more than 30 cents a barrel for consumers and have created price spirals in all the products and services of the industries that use residual oil for fuel. Imports of residual fuel oil have been restricted—since March 10, 1959—through a Presidential proclamation based on recommendation of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. OCDM now is taking a fresh look at the impact of these restrictions on the residual fuel oil picture.

"Coal miners have been led to believe import controls would force oil users to convert to coal, thus providing employment in the coalfields. This has not happened," Evans continued. "Shortages of residual have speeded some conversions to natural gas, but very few users have been willing or able to turn back the clock to the use of coal."

"The fact is," said Evans, "even the railroads, which at one time gained high freight earnings from hauling coal, have converted to oil. The loss of jobs in coal mines is caused by consumers electing to use fuels other than coal. No Government action short of dictatorship can change these consumer preferences."

"The unfortunate coalworker is denied a real solution to his problems by being given false hopes that oil imports will solve his problem," Evans continued. "Nothing could be further from the truth."

Evans noted that the artificial shortages resulting from the imposition of import quotas on residual have produced profits for a select few who have been given import allocations under the import program. He said quota tickets have become valuable property.

"The difference between U.S. prices and world prices on residual oil is more than 30 cents a barrel. Possession of a quota ticket enables the ticketholder to cash in on the windfall profit."

Civil Defense Experiment in Baltimore Highly Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, there has been much criticism of our civil defense program, many persons feeling that it would be absolutely useless in case of attack; others believing that it should be left entirely in the hands of the military; others equally strong in the belief that it should be left to the civilian authorities. In the spring of this year, an experiment was conducted in Baltimore which I believe proves that the military and civilian groups can work together effectively and provide the protection necessary.

The entire program was coordinated by a public relations man, William J. Muth, and provided an all-out informational and instructional project based on the necessity of a greatly accentuated fallout shelter program. It included protection against chemical, biological, and radiological contaminants.

It proved that the military, civilian, and industrial segments of the population can combine efforts to accomplish such a mission. It also established concretely that all media of press, radio, and television are more than willing to cooperate. Many continuing stories on this shelter project appeared in 113 newspapers from Texas to Maine and as far west as Ohio. Complete coverage was provided by UP, AP, and INS.

This experiment included the sealing of a young nurse from the University Hospital, Miss Sara Rafter, in a fallout shelter for 7 complete days. Prior to this, Maj. William Kiser, U.S. Air Force Reserve, spent 24 hours sealed in the shelter to test the operation for safety.

The following organizations cooperated in this subject:

The 628th U.S. Air Force Hospital Reserve Unit, Baltimore, Maj. William S. Kiser, commanding.

State of Maryland Civil Defense Agency, Sherley Ewing, director.

Baltimore City Civil Defense Organization, Col. Arthur H. Shreve, U.S. Army, retired, director.

Dr. Arthur A. Woodward, Aberdeen Proving Ground.

Chemical Corps, U.S. Army.

Miss Sara Rafter, R.N., University Hospital, Baltimore.

Lasting Distributors, Inc., Baltimore, Martin Rankin, president.

Allied Public Relations, Baltimore, William J. Muth, president.

Members of the press, radio, and television.

In addition to providing important data, it is especially interesting to note that the program coincides with the directives on Civil Defense issued by President Kennedy more than a month after this experiment was conducted.

The following newspaper article gives further information on this project:

Finally a realistic, positive approach is being taken to the necessity of our Government to make the American people aware of shelter protection against CBR attack.

In a coordinated program originated by Martin Rankin of Baltimore, the Air Force, the office of Civil Defense and Mobilization, Army Ordnance and Chemical Corps demonstrated that military and civilian components of defense can coordinate their efforts in a joint project designed to make scientific and informational facts available to the American public.

Miss Sara C. Rafter, R.N., University Hospital, shown above [illustration not printed in Record] emerging from a Lasting Blast and Fallout Shelter, is being greeted, left to right, by Maj. William S. Kiser, 628th U.S. Air Force Hospital Reserve Unit, Baltimore, Col. Arthur H. Shreve, director, Civil Defense, Baltimore, Capt. Jean F. Davis; and Sherley Ewing, director of Civil Defense, State of Maryland.

When asked what she thought had been accomplished by her 7-day stay in the shelter at the Baltimore Home Show, Miss Rafter answered that these things will have to be evaluated and reduced in form by Dr. Arthur A. Woodward and the medical staff of the 628th along with the civil defense officials, but "in my opinion Mr. Rankin and Mr. Knight, executives of the Lasting Distributors, have made a definite contribution to the shelter and civil defense program for which our people should be everlastingly thankful."

Profit Limitation Called a Hazard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration has laid before Congress many proposals of a socialistic nature, such as Federal aid to education, public housing, complete supply management for agriculture, and medical care for the aged. It now seems evident that some of the proponents of bureaucratic controls of the economy are looking at control of industry—not from the point of view of restraint of trade or price fixing, but from the point of view of limiting profits. If this step is taken, we can immediately ask if the taxpayers will be asked to pick up the tab for those years when industry sustains a loss.

It would also seem to follow that if profits are to be limited by Federal decree, wage rates, being the largest single item of industrial expense in most cases, would also have to be limited.

We are living in a new age, it is true, but I believe few people who listened to Candidate Kennedy during his campaign interpreted his plans for moving ahead faster as being one of applying positive Federal controls of profits. Some people try to make profit a dirty word, but for anyone who has invested his work, sacrifice, ability, or savings in his own enterprise or that of someone else, profit is the reward of thrift. This has been

one of the greatest attributes of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include with my remarks an excellent article by David Lawrence, entitled "Profit Limitation Called a Hazard," which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of September 11, 1961:

PROFIT LIMITATION CALLED A HAZARD—KENNEDY LETTER TO STEEL INDUSTRY STIRS FEAR OF FEDERAL REPRISAL

(By David Lawrence)

The Kennedy administration has crossed the Rubicon. It has decided to make war on conservative economics and embark on a course of radical economics. It is ignoring the risk that it may plunge the country into more unemployment within the next 18 months and bring about perhaps the worst recession since the 1930's.

For President Kennedy has determined to put certain limits on business profits and the return on investments that stockholders have hitherto expected when putting their savings into private enterprise. The net result could be the gradual collapse of the private enterprise system in America and the beginning of that era of socialism which Nikita Khrushchev has predicted will inevitably lead to communism in another generation in the United States.

President Kennedy's crucial step came a few days ago when he openly threatened the steel industry with reprisals by Government unless it agreed to forgo any price increases at this time. Mr. Kennedy vaguely promised that next year, when the unions ask for still higher wages, he would urge moderation. He didn't define the term. But the entire business world noted that Mr. Kennedy significantly refused to ask the unions at this time to forgo the additional wage increases scheduled for them at the end of this month under a contract signed early in 1960 after a long strike.

The steel industry thus far has absorbed a 10-percent rise in labor costs since 1958 without a price increase. Fairplay would seem to require that, since the steel industry has already absorbed this large increase in wages without a price rise, the least that Mr. Kennedy might have done was to ask labor to cancel its increase scheduled for October 1 this year.

But the Kennedy administration has sitting in the Cabinet, as Secretary of Labor, the man who was general counsel of the biggest steel union in the country. Had there been a Secretary of Commerce in a Republican administration who had previously been a leader in the steel industry—either as president of a large company or as its principal negotiator just a few months earlier during a major strike—the howl that would have gone up about "conflict of interest" would have been heard from coast to coast.

Industry has no voice in the Kennedy Cabinet. The Secretary of Commerce is afraid of his shadow and allowed himself to be influenced by the radicals in the administration when he ordered the virtual suppression of the Business Advisory Council which had existed for decades as a means of communications between business and the executive branch of the Government.

President Kennedy's procedure in writing a letter to 12 steel companies and in immediately making it public is the subject of sharp criticism. He did not invite these steel executives to come to Washington beforehand to give their side of the issue. He took them by surprise as he issued his letter and threatened restrictive measures if they didn't obey.

This is one of the most surprising moves any President has made in recent years, and it is small wonder that it is being regarded

as the beginning of a series of hostile acts to throttle American enterprise and to pave the way for nationalization or socialization of the larger industries in America.

Mr. Kennedy himself has never been regarded as a radical, but he has surrounded himself with advisers who sincerely believe in Government ownership. In giving their advice, they can hardly refrain from advocating a philosophy which could eventually mean the end of private capitalism in America. Every one of these advisers hates communism and all that Mr. Khrushchev stands for, but, as is the case in Britain with the Socialist-Laborites who favor nationalization of industry, they don't always realize the ultimate consequences of current action.

Mr. Kennedy is not himself an economist. He finds himself lost in economic jargon and economic arguments, and tends to follow what seems to him a plausible policy. His economic advisers concede that it is a "most hazardous undertaking" to estimate future output and profits in steel, but they did it just the same and took no account of the need of different companies to buy new plant and equipment or to continue to earn a proper return on investors' money. Instead, a blanket order was favored that would cut profit margins and let labor have its October 1 increase just the same.

Meanwhile, the Department of Justice is engaging in a crusade against large business enterprises by brandishing antitrust suits in their faces almost every day. It is interesting to note that the executives of the 12 companies which got the President's identical letter are virtually forbidden to discuss it with each other, since the subject is price-making. The steel companies could be hauled into court for price collusion if they as much as sat down together to discuss what kind of replies they should make as an industry.

Indeed, the future of all trade associations in America may well be in jeopardy if the Kennedy administration cries out "Price fixing" every time business leaders go to an annual convention of their industry to discuss common problems, including threats coming from foreign competition. The annual meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute had, for instance, long been scheduled for this week, but it was canceled for fear that any meeting of steel executives at this time would be misunderstood. And all this happens in free America.

The Fabulous Faber Industries of Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to an article in the 1961 issue of one of the Goodyear publications—*Business on Wheels*—published in the interest of America's truck fleet operators. "Their Work Is Waste," is the story of Faber Industries, Inc., of Peoria, Ill., the largest city in my district.

Arthur C. Faber has certainly built an impressive empire and I am very proud that Goodyear has seen fit to salute him and his team. Taking what Illinois meatpackers and butchers do not want, the amazing Faber family of industries has built a highly successful

but little known enterprise that markets its products internationally.

Waste material is processed by Faber into four major products. Protein, for one, is used as an important supplement by the manufacturers of livestock feeds. Ground bone material finds a ready market in manufacturing feed ingredients, and bagsful of this product are shipped to all corners of the Nation. A byproduct produced in the greatest quantity is rendered grease used in a wide variety of industrial processes. Animal hides comprise a major facet of the firm's operation, even though it has been separately established as the Delph-Faber Hide Corp.

The firm's founder and board chairman, Arthur C. Faber, is obviously a very resourceful man and the saga of his success is most fascinating.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the *RECORD* at this point:

THEIR WORK IS WASTE

(By Arthur Hemingway)

Rumor around the world has it that America is a Nation of wastrels. But the rumor is quickly reduced to myth for anyone taking a tour of Faber Industries, Inc., of Peoria, Ill. For Faber has built an impressive empire solely by turning unwanted leftovers of one industry—the meatpackers and butchers of the neighboring corn-and-cattle country—into products clamored for by dozens of industries.

It turns the wastes of "harvested" animals into valuable concentrates used to raise the protein content of animal feeds to desired levels; into pure greases for infinite industrial uses; and processes discarded hides for the fine leathers of the world.

One relatively small company has done all this with an efficiency of organization, processing and transport that any industrial giant might well envy. In the process, it has become a recognized leader in an industry which annually produces 3.36 billion pounds of animal proteins and 3.5 billion pounds of animal fat.

The Faber story could start at any one of its efficient affiliates—the Faber Extraction Co., headquartered at Mason City, Ill.; the Delph-Faber Hide Corp., at Springfield; or the Faber Transportation Co., based in Peoria, which owns and operates a fleet of Faber-specialized trucks.

Or the saga could start at any one of five rendering plants at Galesburg, Streator, Springfield, Hillsboro, or Decatur. At these points the material is rendered into tankage ready for toting by semitrailer to the Mason City plant for further processing.

Or it could start at the Mason City plant itself, or even at the docks at Havana, Ill., where one could follow Faber barges loaded with greases down the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers to the 5-million-pound-capacity Faber storage at Marrero, La., and on to Faber's industrial customers. At Havana, Faber's huge grease tank trucks discharge their cargoes into the waiting barges. A barge weighted with 2,400,000 pounds of Faber grease heads south from Havana every 5 weeks.

A logical place, too, to start the Faber tale would be its ultramodern headquarters office in Peoria where a competent corps of executives keeps the flow chart running smoothly.

But there is really only one proper place to begin the story—and that is with Arthur C. Faber. Now board chairman, Faber is an executive's executive. Confident of his staff's capabilities, he now spends much of his time in Mexico overseeing other business interests. Company Secretary John Paulsen

says, "He never hesitated to take the big chance if OK'd by his own judgment and that of the men under him. He delegates responsibility to a carefully chosen executive, then holds him accountable—and creditable—for everything."

TOOK THE BIG CHANCE EARLY

Faber started taking the big chance when he was scarcely out of college in 1920. He inherited a struggling hide business in 1921 from his father, Jacob J. Faber. (The company's roots actually date back to 1865, when an earlier Faber bought and sold the pelts of beaver, mink, and muskrat taken by coonskin-capped trappers tending their lines along the Illinois River.)

Young Faber's first executive decision came in a hurry. He was caught with carloads of calf hides when they dropped from \$1 to 4 cents a pound. Many another young man might have unloaded his legacy and thrown in the sponge. Not young Arthur. In 1929, he took the big chance, got out of the hide business, borrowed \$50,000 and started out as a meatpacker. In 1944, he reversed his field. Caught under price ceilings without Government contracts that would have kept marketing costs down, he sold out to a company which did have the coveted contracts. This enabled him to concentrate his talents full time on the by-product business which he entered in 1936 by buying a site at Galesburg and setting up a reduction plant there.

Succeeding Faber as president is A. C. Boldon, quiet, scholarly, and with a sensitive finger on every phase of the company's diverse operations. Boldon joined the firm as office manager in 1929 after 2 years with a large meat packer.

Heading the hide end of the business, with headquarters in Indianapolis, is Vice President Merle A. Delph. He does all the selling for Faber Industries, supervises 14 hide warehouses scattered around the country.

Secretary John Paulsen is in charge of all buying. He rejoined Faber in 1949 after a 5-year sabbatical with various meat packers, where his connections now stand him in good stead. He first joined Faber in 1937, with a background in livestock and by-products dating to 1907. Paulsen is proud of his company and its achievements in processing animal proteins "so that what is growing can use what has passed on."

A key role in the company's recent rapid rise has been played by R. D. "Dick" Dischert, general manager of Faber Transportation Co. A man with a bear-trap mind, Dischert never misses a fact or mislays a figure. He came to Faber in 1957 to set up the transportation company after heading up all Government-owned transport at the huge Joliet Arsenal.

PARTNERS IN PROGRESS

Rounding out the executive staff are Treasurer Lew Ziegler, who is in charge of all rendering operations; Fred Bisplinghoff, general manager of the feed division and the main Mason City operation; John Swanson, who serves with Dischert, handling all grease operations—buying, selling, transporting; Bud Chumley, who tends 23 scrap routes, buys all raw hides, bones and fat; and Robert Ballantyne who also oversees the operation of an additional 40 trucks.

Directed by this close-cooperating management team, Faber plants, processes, and transport are inseparable partners in the company's progress. With the Mason City plant as the hub, and the five rendering plants the spokes, coordinated transport keeps the wheels rolling.

The material is rendered into tankage at the five outlying plants. Part of their output is sold directly to animal feed companies, but most of it is trucked in big Faber semitrailers to the plant at Mason City. Because of their nature, Faber raw materials and products are no cargoes for

common carriers—hence, the specialized fleet of trucks and barges.

Recently, the company began to make its own stainless steel box bodies. Production was assigned to Dischert, who, in addition to being a traffic-trained expert in transport, is a trained architectural draftsman. This was a specialty that no outside manufacturer could handle to specifications as well as the company itself. The boxes must be leakproof, odorproof, dependable.

With one eye on his box-body manufacturing operation, Dischert is as busy as a hummingbird in a lilac bush, zipping from one Faber plant to another, smoothing the way for his already smooth-functioning fleet.

When the giant tandems unload their cargoes at the Mason City plant, a miracle of automation and chemical magic takes over. A network of conveyors inbound and out, joined by extractors, blenders, solvent reclaimers, operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, processing 30 to 40 tons of tankage every day, and turning out 60,000 pounds of tallow and proteins each day. Three regular shifts tend production at a central control panel where the entire operation can be pinpointed. Extraction is so fully automated that it requires the services of only one operator and one assistant per shift.

Basic secret to both quantity and quality of Faber output is heptane, a solvent that forces that fat out of the tankage fast and effectively. Faber was a process pioneer, and the only one to use heptane today in this type of equipment.

The tankage trucked to the plant and fed to its three extractors via conveyor is as high as 35 percent in fat content until it is penetrated by heptane vapors under high pressure and goes through a 2-hour washing cycle in fluid heptane. Live steam then washes out the heptane, which is reclaimed for reuse by evaporation.

Grease products go directly to storage. But the cracklings, the protein product, are emptied into a hopper and carried by screw conveyor to intermediate storage for cooling prior to grinding, blending, and bagging. A fourth of the plant's output is feed products, about two-thirds inedible greases, and another 10 percent are hides.

FINEST PLANT IN UNITED STATES

The entire process, so seemingly simple because of the minimum manpower required but tremendously complicated in its inner workings, is in the capable hands of Extraction Superintendent Dave Broadhurst, a chemical engineer, who tells you flatly: "We've got the finest extraction plant in the United States. Eight men can handle the entire heptane plant instead of the 16 required by less efficient systems. And we get grease content down to 2.5 percent rather than the 12 percent maximum efficiency of other methods."

But proud as they are of their mechanization and methods, the Faber forces are even prouder of their products. They've taken discarded wastes and made them useful. They've earned the thanks of countless customers. And they've led the way in reducing the national "waste-line."

Regaining a Voice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 28, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like

to include the following editorial appearing in the New Orleans States on September 6, 1961, in support of my bill, H.R. 640:

REGAINING A VOICE

In the case of the American businessman, the right of free speech is considerably abridged.

If he spends money to spread his opinion before the public and this effort is viewed by the internal revenue service as an attempt to influence legislation he can't deduct the expense as an ordinary expense of doing business.

More than a year ago, Representative HALE BOGGS saw the inequity of the situation and introduced remedial legislation in Congress. Meanwhile it continues to gain strength.

Now the second district lawmaker says he is hopeful the bill will be enacted in this Congress.

That the privilege of speaking out should be subject to tax restriction is certainly not in the American tradition. Extension of the discrimination could even muzzle a free press by holding that editorial opinion is taxable.

All the while, Government-operated business which pays no tax is free to spend more and more to influence legislation—frequently legislation which aims at encroachment on the business community.

As a matter of basic justice the Boggs bill deserves passage, restoring free speech to the businessman.

In Secretary Ribicoff's Great Speech Before the American Educational Theater Association He Called for a Federal Arts Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in a great speech before the American Educational Theater Association, meeting in the Waldorf Astoria hotel in New York City on August 29, 1961, Secretary Abraham Ribicoff, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare declared:

There has never been a time when interest in the arts at the seat of government has been so high. The Kennedy administration would like to see the establishment of a National Advisory Council on the Arts—a group of eminent citizens from the arts whose duty it would be to cultivate and encourage our artistic resources and heritage.

The bill setting up the Council has been favorably acted upon by the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now awaiting House action. I have urged the Congress to enact this bill. Under it, the Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States; propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts; cooperate with local, State, and Federal departments and agencies to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts in the best interests of the Nation; and strive to stimulate greater appreciation of the arts by our citizens.

I include Secretary Ribicoff's significant statement on the arts as part of

my remarks for the information of my colleagues:

THE THEATER AS TEACHER

(Address by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare)

It is legend at the Players Club that the god of all the arts once whispered into the ear of young Edwin Booth, and this is what he said:

"I shall give you hunger, and pain, and sleepless nights. Also beauty and satisfactions known to few and glimpses of the heavenly life. None of these you shall have continually and of their coming and going you shall not be foretold."

You whose lifework is the theater—and the introduction of young people to the theater—you have known the sleepless nights, as well as the satisfactions and "glimpses of the heavenly life" your art offers.

You will appreciate the answer one of my favorite critics gave me the other day when I asked him why he prefers the theater to the rest of his amusement-page beat.

"That's simple," he said. "In television, the people are diminished. They are thumb-sized. In the movies, the people are enlarged. They're bigger than I am. But in the theater, the people are just my size. When I watch them, I can even forget where I am."

How right he is. Other art forms can be wonderful indeed. But the theater mirrors life in scale. In the theater, you lean forward for fear you will miss something—you are drawn ahead—you are carried out of your seat by the live people on the stage.

There is an immediacy about a good play that is irresistible. It is an extension, an illumination of our experience. It satisfies our appetites for further experience, for fascinating language, for the chance of meet interesting people. This is true of plays that truly entertain and truly enlighten.

The best plays are more than diversions. They are great teachers. They convince us that what is happening on the stage—however far removed in time or in geography—is not very different from what is happening in our hearts and in our everyday lives. And so we learn from them.

You members of the American Educational Theater Association know the effect such plays have on an audience. You know too the hunger that audiences have for the theater—the theater that delights the eye and ear and enriches the mind and heart.

If anyone doubted this hunger for a minute—and we in public life frequently hear the excuse that the public isn't ready for or doesn't appreciate this or that fine art—such doubts should have been erased by the long queues that formed this summer to see "Much Ado About Nothing" in Central Park.

You know these things. For a quarter of a century, they have been your concern and your vocation.

On this, your silver jubilee celebration, you have chosen as your theme "The Theater and the Human Bond." "A group of strangers," you say, "becomes one living unit in the darkened house when the curtain opens—all over the world, at all times, and at all ages."

On this, your silver jubilee, then, I think it is appropriate to ask how you teachers of the theater can help strengthen this human bond.

Yours is a tremendous opportunity. More of our youngsters are enjoying college and university education than ever before. In the next years their numbers will, we all hope, increase even further. Community theater and children's theater groups mushroom across the land. This means that out of all the people in the theater, you members of the American Educational Theater Association are the ones who have the chance to touch young—and not so young—minds.

Your first challenge is to teach so creatively, so imaginatively, that you will convey the best of our dramatic heritage, experience, and taste to a new generation, and to adults as well—that you will strengthen the ties that bind our civilization to the great civilizations of the past.

There is no greater opportunity than the teacher's, and our national tragedy is that we have not made full use of it.

Asked what the theater had given him, the actor, Howard Lindsay, answered:

"It has been my education. Where else could I have traveled so far? I have been in the streets of Corinth when Jason and Medea were throwing harsh words at each other. I was at Aulis when the Greek fleet sailed to Troy. I was in Mycenae when Orestes came back to kill his mother Clytemnestra. I have been in the drawing rooms of Lady and Lord Windermere of London. And I shouldn't forget to say, I have ridden into Western towns with the James brothers. Where else could I have done things like that?"

Where else indeed?

Can you teachers of the theater take your students to these—and further places? Can you give them the sense of continuity, the depth and breadth of vision that a deep knowledge of your art conveys?

Can you give them something more? Many of our young people have lost the satisfaction of the craftsmen of old—the satisfaction of doing a job carefully and lovingly—the fulfillment of work well done. They go to school—they graduate—they get jobs to support themselves and their families.

You can help them find this satisfaction. For the theater is a place where people share responsibility—where they labor hard together—where they have such fun that they even forget they are learning and working. If you give this experience to youngsters and to amateur community players, you will truly have taught well, you will have strengthened the ties that bind human beings, one with another.

You have a further responsibility—a further challenge. It lies waiting to be seized.

There are only, I am told, about 70,000 commercial theater seats available to the public in the United States. Some 30,000 of these are in New York City, and their number is diminishing. There are many reasons for this—you are all aware of the problem; I will not go into it today.

But Americans want to go to the theater. They flock to see great plays. When stripped of its social pretensions—what Prof. Eric Bentley calls its "amazingly upper class mores and extraordinarily inconvenient prices and schedules"—the theater is a tremendously popular attraction.

Bentley speaks of the "social apparatus" that used to stand between the public and the enjoyment of good music. "Opera and symphony," he says, "were addressed to dowagers. The workingman didn't have the right clothes for the occasion, or the right accent, or the right kind of chitchat. Invited to a concert he could hardly be expected not to feel a pariah. Much the same is true of theater."

He goes on to point out that in the cultural revolution that is underway all over the world, the theater could play a leading part because it is "more accessible to the new untrained audiences than perhaps any other high art whatsoever." . . . And this fact "gives it a certain responsibility."

This is the responsibility you theater educators shoulder today. This is your challenge: to strengthen the bond between the theater and diverse communities throughout the land.

The word "educate" comes from the Latin verb "lead out." This is what you can do—lead people out of themselves and into the common meeting place—where they can share their art with others. Your theater groups do not fulfill their purpose if they

confine themselves to a series of exercises—if they do not reach all the audiences that are anxious to be reached.

Some of your members have of course served their communities with notable success. They have done so in their own cities, and they have traveled abroad in many lands, delighting their audiences and creating great good will and friendship for our country.

They have truly given of themselves to strengthen the bond between human beings throughout the world. They have set a standard for us all.

Will you join them?

I think—I know—you will.

Just as it plays a role in bridging the gap between different segments and groups and countries in our society, the theater can play an important role in bridging the gap between what C. P. Snow has called "the two cultures." We are all concerned about the wall that divides the humanities from the ever-expanding physical sciences. We are all anxious to do what we can to further our scientific achievements. We are not "antiscientists," who deplore the discoveries of science in favor of the beauties of art. Far from it. We know there is great beauty as well as hope in the giant revolution which has taken place in man's knowledge of himself and of the world.

But we know that if we are to act constructively, we must tap our magnificent artistic resources imaginatively and diligently. A broad and deep awareness of the arts enriches the scientist as well as the nonscientist and is indispensable to the full life of all mankind.

We live today in one of the crucial eras of world history. The impact of man's new power upon man himself is the stuff of real drama—and through drama as well as other arts could man better understand his place in the new world that he is creating.

There has never been a time when interest in the arts at the seat of government has been so high. The Kennedy administration would like to see the establishment of a National Advisory Council on the Arts—a group of eminent citizens from the arts whose duty it would be to cultivate and encourage our artistic resources and heritage.

The bill setting up the Council has been favorably acted upon by the House Committee on Education and Labor and is now awaiting House action. I have urged the Congress to enact this bill. Under it, the Council would recommend ways to maintain and increase the cultural resources of the United States; propose methods to encourage private initiative in the arts; cooperate with local, State, and Federal departments and agencies to foster artistic and cultural endeavors and the use of the arts in the best interests of the Nation; and strive to stimulate greater appreciation of the arts by our citizens.

Further, it could act as a coordinating group between private and governmental activities in the arts, pointing out where it believes official encouragement might be helpful, yet always sensitive to the need for the fullest possible freedom of creativity.

For in fostering and encouraging the arts, we must have it strictly understood that the Government cannot and does not wish to speak through the arts. The arts must be free and not an official mouthpiece. A play is not a state paper. The only test for an actor or a director or a painter or a musician should be the excellence of his endeavor before the judgment of his peers.

In this crucial moment when the currents of history are swift and changing, we who bear the responsibility of Government seek to build. We know that the old ways alone will not do—that we must seek new ways and find new means.

And all segments of American society are responding. Each is examining its role and

its potential. Each is dedicating itself to constructive action for the common good.

You whose lifework is the arts—you whose lifework is education—you too are examining your role and your potential.

I ask you only to do your best, to achieve the high levels that you yourselves value, and to inspire in your students an appreciation of the enduring and the beautiful.

I ask you to strive to reflect the times in which we live—to understand them—to teach from them—to improve upon them. We must work to make our arts so rich—so exciting—so inventive—that they mirror our life together as did the arts of the Greeks and of the Elizabethan Age.

Then we will have met our challenge. Then we will have done our part to strengthen the human bond.

Address of Congressman Fernand J. St. Germain, of Rhode Island, at the Centennial of the Death of Taras Shevchenko, Soyuzivka, N.Y., Sunday, August 27, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 27, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. ST. GERMAIN, visited the Catskill area of New York to deliver an address to an assembly of people of Ukrainian origin. The address is notable not only for its subject matter and context but also because it was delivered by Mr. ST. GERMAIN in Ukrainian dialect. Our most versatile Member is fluent in French, most eloquent in English, and now demonstrates his command of this most difficult language. We are truly fortunate to have him among us.

The text of the speech follows:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN FERNAND J. ST. GERMAIN, OF RHODE ISLAND, AT THE CENTENNIAL OF THE DEATH OF TARAS SHEVCHENKO, SOYUZIVKA, N.Y., SUNDAY, AUGUST 27, 1961

"Bury me, be done with me,
Rise and break your chain,
Water your new liberty
With blood for rain.

Then, in the mighty family
Of all men that are free,
May be sometimes, very softly
You will speak of me?"

My friends, wherever the people of the Ukraine can gather in freedom, even if it be the freedom of their own minds, they remember Taras Shevchenko. The poetic words of Shevchenko echo now, as they did a hundred years ago, the past, the present, and the future of the Ukrainian peoples. His sentiments, his hopes, his fears are present today as they were in his day and age. The same fears that gripped the hearts of the Ukraines of the 19th century grip the hearts of the Ukraines of the 20th century. The love of freedom which found its expression in the lines of Shevchenko is echoed by those same lines today. The flame which began to burn in the 19th century is still burning

and is growing ever hotter while those who would suppress that love of freedom try to stamp it out.

A part of my heritage brings me to your lovely estate, here in the Catskills. My maternal grandmother left the Ukraine in 1907 to find freedom in this country. She brought with her the love of God, the customs, traditions, heritage and language of the Ukrainian people. She has been, to me, a reflection of Shevchenko's words: " * * * in your own house lies your righteousness, your strength, and your liberty."

My mother carried on the customs of her native land. We celebrated the Ukrainian Christmas and had the traditional caroling and the foods which are so much a part of that season in the Ukraine.

In my childhood, no one could deny the existence of a Ukrainian language. I learned of my heritage in the tongue of that heritage. I learned the folklore, customs, and hopes of the Ukraines in a tongue which was more than simply a peasant idiom, as the language of the Ukraines was once called. The Ukraines have a proud history and can stand shoulder to shoulder with the other great peoples of our globe.

The survival of Ukrainian lore and language is a testament to the will and strength of the people of the Ukraines. The story of your homeland, and it is partly mine, is a tragedy which reflects the sufferings of all areas which have been strapped by oppression. In "The Dream" Shevchenko vividly described a people under the thumb of the oppressor. The clothing is stripped from beggars and the poor must provide shoes for the feet of princes, widows are pummeled for their taxes and the sons are taken off to the army only to die in the mud and filth which dictators and oppressors provide for their belabored armies who fight because of force rather than because of ideals. He points to the forced labor for which the people receive no compensation except the scorn of the masters for whom they dig the gold which is poured down the throats of the greedy.

Does this sound familiar? It is the Ukraine dominated by the Russian czar, it is Germany under Hitler, it is the Jews under Egypt, it is the Russians under communism, it is Europe under the barbarians, it is the Ukraine under Stalin and now under Khrushchev. Oppression has not changed whether it be in the times before Christ or 1,961 years after Christ. I doubt it will ever change just as man's desire for freedom has never, and will never, change.

In a blazing indictment of oppressors of the Ukrainian people Shevchenko wrote:

"Our souls yield not to grievous ills,
To freedom march our stubborn wills
Through waves of trouble o'er us roll
The waves move not the steadfast soul
Our living spirit is not in chains
The word of God in glory reigns."

The Ukraines began to find their modern identity in the 19th century. The publication of Kotlyarevsky's "Eneida" in 1798 is the beginning of modern Ukraine. This poem revived the patriotism and pride of heritage that had been sleeping in the breasts of the people for almost a century. It came after various attempts, attempts that were almost successful to end the Ukrainian identification. By the mid 18th century the czars of Russia had destroyed all Ukrainian political forms and began to Russinize the culture of the people. The name Ukraine was abolished, the area was called Little Russia, the language was abrogated and the customs strangled. As America emerged a free and independent entity, the Ukraine began to sink beneath the swell of oppression and lose her identity.

The Ukraine needed an impetus for it to emerge as an identifiable and dynamic nation. It needed a genius who could transform the smoldering emotions of the people to words which could be written, spread, heralded throughout the world. It was Shevchenko who emerged as that genius. Through the medium of the Ukrainian written word he brought to the fore the yearnings for liberty, the sufferings under oppression, the hopes for a brighter future, of a great people. In the passage I quoted a few moments ago, he told the world that even under the hand of a tyrant the spirit of the people was unbroken and the people have kept their faith in themselves and in their God. It is to God that they look for hope and salvation.

Shevchenko did not delve into political prophecy. He did not try to predict the future course of Ukrainian events nor did he think the old system would return to his people. His loyalty was to the mother country; he wanted her free, independent, and under a just system of government.

Shevchenko used the vernacular Ukraine language, for it was by way of this vehicle that the hopes and wishes of the people could best be expressed. Because of political circumstances he could not come forth directly with his sentiments but had to use allusions and vagueness. His poems are rich with the folklore and history of the Ukraine. It is the use of the tongue and heritage of the people that has endeared him to the Ukrainians for a century.

Shevchenko was a reflection of the tragedy of the Ukrainians in his personal life as well as in his poetry. He typified the sufferings of his native land and the hardship which all the sons of the Ukraine had to undergo. In him we can see embodied the past of the Ukraine but in him we can also see the fires of the future. He spoke for the future as well as the past, a future of liberty and freedom.

Of his 47 years, only 9 were spent as a freeman. He was born a slave and remained so for 24 years; for 10 he was a prisoner in Siberia and for 3½ he was under police supervision. He lived as his country lived, under oppression, tyranny, and enforced guidance. Clarence Manning, a great scholar of Shevchenko's work, poignantly described his work as the "poetical synthesis of national aspirations."

"Our cause shall rise
Our freedom rise
Though tyrants rage."

And, rage the tyrants did. His early works tell of the people under serfdom and the precarious life of the peasants. He tells of social injustice and the debauchery of the masters in a land ruled by the lords and their henchmen. Although his words are of despair and sadness during the exile in Siberia, he has a message of hope as in the lines just quoted. Oppression may slow and restrain the cause of freedom but it cannot stop the will of people to be free. This was as true in the 19th century as it is today in the mid-20th century.

Great poetry is timeless. It is composed of lines wherein people may find themselves whether it be at the time the poem is written or a century later. Shevchenko's poetry is in such a category. It has as much meaning today as it did when it was written. His words are as vivid in 1961 as they were in 1861 because the Ukraines, and millions of other freedom-loving peoples, are under the yoke of a new tyranny. It is a new tyranny in name only, for communism is as old as tyranny itself. It is not new for the mind to be blocked from the knowledge of truth, for the will to be dominated, for the present to be controlled and the future planned without the free reasoning of the people

involved. The only thing new is the name "communism."

"Arouse ye, be men.
For evil days come.
Quickly a people enchained
Shall tear off their fetters;
Judgment will come.
Dnieper and the hills will speak."

Shevchenko foretold the rising of his people. He knew then, as we know now, that a free people will bear the chains only so long and then they shall tear off their fetters. The tsar and those who aided his tyranny would be overthrown for

"They harness the people
With heavy yokes.
Evil they plough
With evil they sow.
What crops will spring?
What harvest will you see?"

The Communists, in this centennial year of the bard of the Ukraine, are using Shevchenko's poetry in an attempt to convince the people of the Ukraine that their beloved bard was predicting the Communist social revolution. In order to reap this message from the lines of Shevchenko, the Communists have "adjusted" his poetry to eliminate any counterrevolutionary doctrines which he might have expressed. Parts of his poems have been eliminated, new words and ideas have been substituted for the original lines, meanings have been slurred and references to God and religion have been left out. It is this new Shevchenko which is fed to the people of the Ukraine this centennial year.

Why have the Communists been compelled to give recognition to Shevchenko? They have been compelled to do so for the same reason that their new Shevchenko has failed. The people of the Ukraine, remember Shevchenko whether they be free, as those here today, or enslaved as they are in the homeland. They remember his glorification of their past, his presentation of the tragedies of his day and his hopes for the future. Those ideas were not passed from generation to generation by books and magazines. The words of Shevchenko, his hopes and ideals, were and are still being spread by the people to their sons and grandsons. Pravda may broadcast the new Shevchenko but the people know the real Shevchenko, the true reflection of their sentiments and ideals.

Because he is so loved and revered by his people, the Communists must honor him, and because his ideals are known to the people they heed not the new Shevchenko.

Shevchenko wanted freedom, justice, and dignity for his people and his words utter the same cry today for the people of Russia, of China, of Eastern Europe and of Cuba. The bard did not want his people to go from the tyranny of the czars to the oppression of the commissars. Shevchenko foresaw a long, hard struggle to gain the ideals he held so dearly but the final victory would come; a cold war, a hot war, a lukewarm war—freedom will out. He saw freedom as the victor for:

"Fear not to fight, you'll win at length
For you, God's ruth,
For you is freedom, for you is strength,
And Holy Truth."

The truth and freedom are partners and those who would deny them to their people are doomed to failure, are doomed to lose the loyalty of their people, are bound to be caught beneath the waves of justice and dignity to which all people aspire.

The people of the Ukraine, because their heritage and their knowledge of Shevchenko is handed down from generation to generation, are not fooled by the Communist line. God is a part of Ukrainian life, as it was

for Shevchenko. Religion has played a great role in the lives of the people. Freedom was the cry not slavery, be it of the serf or Communist variety.

The people of East Berlin, until barbed wire and Russian troops made it impossible, echoed the thoughts of Shevchenko when they chose freedom over tyranny, liberty over oppression, democracy over communism. Throughout the world people watch Russian moves with care and concern; they remember Budapest and the savagery with which the freedom fighters were crushed. I hope we do not again see such brutality but as long as people desire peace and are kept from it such scenes will occur. The fetters will be broken unless those who rule with the iron thumb relax the grip and let the people determine their own destinies.

"Why freedom grew up with us
Bathed in the Dnieper
Rested her head on our hills
The far-flung Steppes are her garments."

Has anyone said better than Shevchenko that the Ukrainian people have been free, want to be free and will be free? The Ukrainians have a history that is one of an oppressed people reaching for freedom and their history has done much to keep their faith in God that freedom, liberty, and justice might come to their people.

Marketing Program for Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, I am glad to join with a number of my colleagues from wheat-producing areas of the United States in today introducing legislation to establish a marketing program for wheat. At the same time, we are urging the Secretary of Agriculture to develop, under the procedures provided by the Agricultural Act of 1961, recommendations for a comprehensive, long-range wheat program, embodying the principles of this legislation, in sufficient time so that the Secretary's recommendations can be submitted to the Congress by January 1962.

Basically, this is a simple program. Instead of wheat acreage allotments as we know them, each producer would be assigned a quota in bushels which he can sell into the market for food and export. The total quota for all producers would be established somewhat less than the total wheat requirements, with the balance needed to come out of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

In order for a producer to receive a marketing quota, he would retire at least 10 percent of his historical wheat acres. This will prevent the shifting of the burden of overproduction to other commodities.

This program has many advantages over the present allotment program. Most important, I believe, will be the effect on quality of wheat produced. Under the present program a farmer can dispose of all the bushels he can raise on his allotted acres. Thus, his incen-

tive is to grow the most bushels possible, regardless of the quality of wheat. Under the legislation I have introduced today, since the farmer can sell only a limited number of bushels for food and export, he will want to produce the highest quality possible in order to receive a premium for this limited quantity. As a result we will have a higher quality of wheat for domestic consumption as well as an improved quality in our wheat exports.

Another important feature of this program will be an orderly reduction of Government stocks to a desirable level. By this approach the Government will be able to reduce its stocks each year without disrupting the market. This will result in a tremendous saving to the taxpayer.

As compared with the wheat program in effect in 1961, this new approach could save the Government at least \$200 million the first year and up to \$500 million by the end of the third year. This saving would be due to the disposition of Government stocks plus the savings in storage charges as a result of the reduction in inventory.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Department of Agriculture will support this meaningful and workable program, which also deserves the support of the Congress.

Fort Worth Star-Telegram Questions the Hanford Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the Fort Worth Star-Telegram is one of the leading newspapers in Texas. In order that the Members of the House may have the benefit of the views of that newspaper concerning the Hanford project, I include two of its recent editorials.

They follow:

[From the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, Aug. 14, 1961]

A GOOD TURN

The American people, preoccupied with the various foreign crises, may have paid little notice to the 235-to-164 House vote that killed a proposal to build an atomic electric plant at Hanford, Wash. The action was of tremendous importance to them, however. Not only did it save them a significant amount of cash, but it kept public power advocates from throwing open the door to a project that would have been costly in terms of both money and principle.

The proposed plant would have cost \$85 million. It would have been used to utilize steam from the new plutonium production reactors of the Atomic Energy Commission at Hanford.

As Representative CRAIG HOSMER, of California, said in opposition to the project, it would have taken "every cent paid to the Government this year by 430,826 taxpayers." The resulting plant would have been, not a new and promising method of producing electricity, but an "old-fashioned steam generator."

The worst is, however, that the Hanford project was reported to have been designated as a springboard from which a whole network of public powerplants, with lines lacing the Nation from coast to coast, was to have been built. The plan reportedly was discussed recently in the office of Secretary of the Interior Udall at a meeting attended by several known advocates of public power development.

Representatives HOSMER, and JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, who led the opposition, and others who joined them in defeating the measure, are to be congratulated for their alertness in foiling this new effort at Federal encroachment into a field where private enterprise has demonstrated competence and efficiency in serving the public interest.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Sept. 9, 1961]

THE ATTEMPT TO SAVE A PUBLIC POWER SNEAK

Liberals in Congress haven't given up in their effort to sneak a public power program in the back door by disguising it as an economy measure attached to the Atomic Energy Commission's increased appropriations. Conferees on the AEC bill have just recommended the adoption of a watered-down version of the so-called Hanford project. In a House vote taken after the project was exposed as a device for further entrenching the Federal Government in the power-generating business, the whole proposal was rejected by a vote of 235 to 164.

The plan originally called for a \$95 million appropriation to build generators that would utilize the steam from the AEC's new plutonium production facility at Hanford, Wash. The conferees whittled it down to a \$58 million fund for construction of one 400,000-kilowatt generator.

None of the four advantages named by the conferees would justify the project. These were: 1. All the electric power produced at the facility will be used for national defense purposes at the AEC's Hanford works. 2. Since the electric power production is limited to the AEC installation, the question of whether or not AEC would be in the commercial power business is completely eliminated. 3. The trimmed-down plant still would be the world's largest atomic power-plant operating from a single nuclear reactor. 4. Economic studies indicate that the entire cost of the generating plant would be paid for with interest in 9 years.

Each of these arguments is refuted in the minority statement issued by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania. He notes that while all the power produced by the plant might be used for the Hanford works, it is not needed and would create a power surplus in the area. It has been proposed, he further revealed, that the surplus would be fed into the Bonneville power grid supplying California and would thus amount to an increase in Federal power offered to the public. He also pointed out that the construction of another "old-fashioned" steam generator at a place where it was not needed, though it was the world's largest, would not enhance the U.S. position in the nuclear power race and that Federal power advocates had to try three times before they could come up with a study supporting the economic feasibility of the plant.

Aside from these logical counter-arguments, however, it stands to reason that nobody would be making a do-or-die effort for the Hanford project on the grounds stated. The opportunity it poses for a great leap forward in public power is the only explanation for such zeal on the part of the liberals. Taxpayers should instruct their Congressmen to reaffirm their opposition to this flank attack on private enterprise.

The Berlin Problem Evaluated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 6, 1961

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that the major trouble spot confronting us today in the bitterly cold war going on between the Communists and the free nations of the Western World in Berlin. Not since the beginning of the cold war, in fact, have we been confronted with such an explosive and dangerous situation as we now face over the tragically divided German city.

In a series of two articles, the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, has evaluated the developments in the Berlin crisis since President Kennedy met with Premier Khrushchev at Vienna in June. He has discussed the problems confronting us in negotiations and he has pointed out some of the avenues of action available to us.

These are pointed and revealing articles—they are articles which go a long way toward enabling us to see this very complex problem in perspective—and I urge my colleagues to give them their close attention.

The articles follow:

SINCE VIENNA

(By Walter Lippmann)

Last June at the meeting in Vienna the President realized how seriously Mr. Khrushchev meant business about Berlin. A Western policy had to be formed at once and measures had to be taken before the end of the year. However, it is apparent now that while the Vienna conversations alerted and aroused the President, they did not provide him with the practical working basis of a policy. In order to have a policy he needed to know not only that Mr. Khrushchev would move on Berlin, but how he intended to go about it.

Not knowing this, the President and his advisers supposed that Khrushchev in 1961 would repeat what Stalin had done in 1948, that he would try to conquer West Berlin by blockading it. Thus far, the assumption has proved to be wrong. As a result, the Western allies were caught unprepared to deal with the actual, as distinguished from the supposed, Soviet strategy, which is revealed by the action of August 13. For instead of blockading West Berlin, Khrushchev sealed off East Berlin.

The administration had failed to take into account the fact that Khrushchev could act powerfully, but with measures short of war, to reduce the Western position in West Berlin. It has long been known that an embargo was a possibility. But the preoccupation of the President's advisers with the memory of Stalin's blockade in 1948 prevented them from preparing adequately for the formidable measures short of war which were available to Khrushchev.

The effect of the miscalculation has been far reaching. It led the administration to concentrate its energy on convincing Khrushchev that the West would fight if he interfered with physical access to West Berlin. This is true. It will fight if he interferes with Western access to West Berlin. It was a prudent precaution to make this plain to Khrushchev. But it should not have been sold to the American people and to the world as a policy. The exclusive and excessive pre-

occupation with proving our will to fight a blockade left us unprepared to deal with the actual embargo. On August 13 we had no policy, and there is reason to ask whether we are on the way to having one now.

By concentrating so exclusively on deterring another blockade, the President found himself accepting the advice which came to him from Paris and from Bonn and in Washington from the veterans of Stalin's blockade. He was told that if he stood firm, he could stand pat. Khrushchev was bluffing and if the President did not flinch first, Khrushchev would flinch first, and would once more retreat, as he did in 1958, leaving everything as it is. Until it was swept away by events, this pipedream clouded the vision and narcotized the will to face the realities of the German situation.

On August 13 Khrushchev went into action. He used a very different strategy than the one which this country had been told to prepare for, and so the test of wills turned out to be not a wrestling match but jiu-jitsu. By the embargo, which was illegal and cruel but was a measure well short of war, Khrushchev struck a deep and damaging blow at the Western position in West Berlin and West Germany.

His highly sophisticated action could not, I think, have been improvised in the few weeks after the President had called for a degree of mobilization. The sealing off of half a city is a highly technical operation. The action had all the marks of long deliberation on how to strike most surely and most accurately, without the risk of war, at the Achilles' heel of the Western position. Moreover, only if we assume that the plan has long been in Khrushchev's mind can we explain why he has been swearing that he would get the Berlin bone out of his throat this year and at the same time that he would do it without a blockade and a war.

The Achilles' heel of the Western position is that the morale of the West Berliners, their will to stay in the city and to resist pressure and blandishment, depends on their faith in the Atlantic alliance. They have to believe that they will live to see the alliance bring about the unification of the two Germans and the restoration of their own city as the German capital. This belief is what Khrushchev struck at on August 13. Without attacking West Berlin, he raised a wall which was designed not only to stop the refugees but also to prove to the Germans that the Western allies were unable to reunify Germany. The Germans understood this at once. But so unprepared was Washington for the reality of the German question that days passed before it realized how momentous a change had been brought about. Washington had no policy to deal with what actually happened—unless sending the Vice President and General Clay to West Berlin can be called a policy.

For a true measure of what has happened, we may take an official statement, made in 1959, by Dr. Grewe, who is Dr. Adenauer's Ambassador in Washington. He was writing about the previous Berlin crisis. "West Berlin cannot, in the long run, be held," he said, "if its population must come to the conclusion that the West has in fact accepted the division of Germany." Why? Because if Berlin cannot again become the capital of Germany, many of its people, particularly the younger ones, will drift away to the West and others will make their peace with the East.

We are now in the preliminary stages of those negotiations which both sides have declared they want. The negotiations will begin with the stark fact that Khrushchev has forced the Western allies to acquiesce in, to acknowledge tacitly, the partition of Germany. He is, to be sure, some distance from his full objective which, in the current campaign, is to bring about what he calls the "codification" of the German settlement,

that is the formal and legal recognition that World War II has ended with the partition of Germany. But during this summer he has put himself in the position of negotiating from the accomplished fact that the partition has taken place and that it has not been opposed. He holds in the iron grip of the Red Army the thing on which negotiation will turn.

With the division of Germany a physical fact, the significance of West Berlin has been greatly reduced. Berlin is no longer the escape hatch from the East. It is very much less than it was before the entry point of Western propaganda and intelligence. Its economic expansion is throttled down, and almost certainly its working population will decline. Above all West Berlin is no longer the visible symbol and tangible pledge that the communism will be pushed back of the Oder-Neisse line, perhaps back of the Vistula River. What is left is a human and moral commitment, which will be honored, to protect the physical basis of the way of life which people of West Berlin now enjoy.

There is no denying that our bargaining position has been diminished. It will take a very high order of statesmanship to repair it. Such statesmanship does not come cheaply. Besides insight and imagination it will need the kind of moral courage which is very rare, the courage to tell the people hard and unpopular truths which it has long been thought inexpedient to speak about.

In another article I shall attempt to describe some of the problems of negotiating about Berlin.

ON NEGOTIATING ABOUT BERLIN

(By Walter Lippmann)

As we get ready to negotiate about Berlin we need to know concretely what is our commitment. A month ago the answer to this question was plain enough. When we said we would defend the freedom of West Berlin, we meant, to be precise, that people and goods must continue to move freely along the air corridors, the turnpikes, the railroads, and the canals. If access on these routes is open, West Berlin will have the physical basis of its freedom, freedom to elect its government, personal liberty, and economic freedom as part of the West German economy. This physical basis of West Berlin's freedom is what we are committed to defend, if necessary, by war.

But while this commitment is still in full force, the Soviet action of August 13 in sealing off East Berlin has raised a new problem. It is whether the half-city can continue to flourish, whether it will not wither on the vine. Dr. Adenauer's Ambassador has said that Berlin will wither if the physical partition of Germany, which was consummated on August 13, becomes an accepted and established fact. So we can no longer say that if the access routes are kept open, this in itself will make secure the future of West Berlin.

If the half-city is to continue to flourish its people must be given reason to believe that they have a function to perform in the future of the German nation. It is not easy to give them that belief, and while, as Vice President JOHNSON has said rather too imprecisely, our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor are pledged in West Berlin, we are in fact pledged to protect access. But we are not and cannot be pledged to a guarantee of the prosperity of West Berlin. All we can promise is to try, provided the West Germans cooperate, to negotiate a status for West Berlin which will give its inhabitants a sense of security and confidence in the future. This cannot possibly be done merely by standing firm and standing pat.

The President will now have to decide whether his objective in the coming negotiations is merely to keep open the access routes or whether he will try for a wider objective—

not only for the physical freedom of West Berlin but for its dignity and prosperity. This is a hard and complicated decision.

If he concentrates on this narrow objective, he can probably achieve it by standing firm on the decision to resist if the access routes are closed. For while the Soviet Union will still have great opportunity to harass the access routes, it does not have a vital interest in blockading them. But not to interfere with access, or not to interfere very much, will not be sufficient. The Allied rights of access must be reconfirmed in some kind of contract. For otherwise, the people of West Berlin will be left in a dangerous and demoralizing uncertainty. The Soviet price for a reconfirmation of the rights of access will now have to be explored.

Assuming the best, that the price is moderate and honorable, the outcome will leave West Berlin free. But after the action of August 13, Berlin, however free, will be a doomed and dying city. To keep West Berlin not only free, but alive and flourishing, it will have to be given a significant and attractive function to perform in the years to come. If this can be done at all, the coming negotiations will have to go far beyond freedom of access. There will have to be a new attempt to negotiate a wide settlement in Germany and in Central Europe.

Our position today would be far stronger if, last June instead of conceding the initiative to Khrushchev, we had launched a campaign for a wide settlement. But as events have shown Americans, in the West European opinion, have not been prepared by their leaders for any such big diplomatic adventure.

A wide settlement is inconceivable unless West and East agree on some arrangement which opens the door to the eventual reunion of the two Germans. The difficulties of reaching such an agreement are enormous.

There is, of course, the Soviet opposition which is now embodied in the physical partition of Berlin. But we must not forget how strong is the Western opposition to German reunification. It is not an open opposition. But it is much stronger than has been fully appreciated in this country. The two chief Western European institutions are NATO and the Common Market. In both there is a basic assumption that in fact Germany will remain divided. There is no place for East Germany in NATO—not unless we suppose the inconceivable which is that the Soviets would permit East Germany to join NATO. And there is no place for East Germany in the Common Market as long as it is a Communist state and its main economic powers are with the Soviet bloc.

Although it is never openly avowed, the whole of Europe, West and East, from France to Poland and Czechoslovakia is deeply committed to the partition of Germany. As for the Bonn Republic, its attitude is ambiguous. It does not countenance partition but it has learned to live comfortably without reunification.

This would seem to argue that there is an all-European consensus. In considerable measure there is, and that is why there is no crusading spirit in Europe to reunify Germany. But in France and in Germany the key to policy is not that they object to the fact of partition. It is that they fear the effect of acknowledging it.

Why? Because if the partition were signed, sealed, and delivered—which is what Khrushchev is after—the interests of the West Germans in the Atlantic Alliance may be weakened.

Both Dr. Adenauer and General de Gaulle fear greatly what the Germans would do then. Might they not come to believe that they must deal not with NATO but with Moscow? Dr. Adenauer and General de Gaulle are haunted by the fear that one of Dr. Adenauer's successors may do once again

what the Germans have so often done in the past—make a deal with the Russians at the expense of the West.

The men charged with German affairs in Paris and Washington are predisposed to think that, all things considered, the status quo is better than anything which can be negotiated. The wider objective, which is to work out a future for West Berlin, has few official supporters. In the calculus of risks it seems too venturesome.

It is venturesome. But nothing ventured, nothing gained. It will probably be the opening of what the President might call a new frontier in European politics, beginning with a recognition of the fact that there are two German states, and that unless, and until they reunite, West Berlin must be held in trust as an international city. Moreover, in order to stabilize this divisional arrangement there almost certainly would have to be an agreement on controlled nuclear disarmament and reduction of conventional armament from, let us say, the Rhine to the Vistula.

A philosopher of history can say that the world is still too primitive to construct rationally such a solution. But he might add that if catastrophe is averted, some such settlement might gradually come into being.

If this solution is premature, then negotiation will have to turn on the narrower objective which would be a contract concerning physical access to West Berlin. Without such a contract the Germans and the rest of us will have no relief from permanent apprehension and anxiety.

The President himself cannot negotiate such a contract with Mr. Khrushchev. The critical decision to be taken in the West is what price to pay for the contract. This decision must be made with the firm cooperation of the West German Government. After the German election, Bonn will have to nerve itself to face the fact that unless there is a very wide central European settlement, the partition of Germany will become frozen as an accomplished fact.

Help Khrushchev Avoid a Dangerous Mistake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the magazine, *Nation's Business*, for September 1961, contains an editorial which I believe is most timely and which presents a commonsense point of view. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

As the moment of truth in Berlin comes nearer, the American people are solidly with the President in facing up to Russia. They have accepted willingly—perhaps eagerly—whatever peril or sacrifice a firm position in this crisis requires.

They will, as the President predicted, bear "the burdens which must be borne if freedom is to be defended. Americans have willingly borne them before and they will not flinch now."

The world will be spared much misery if our enemies accept this Presidential analysis as accurate. The danger is that, like others before them, the Communists may make what Mr. Kennedy has called "the dangerous mistake of assuming that the West was too selfish and too soft and too divided to resist invasions of freedom in other lands."

Unfortunately, this dangerous mistake is not unreasonable. Anyone might make it after listening from a distance as Washington catalogs the urgent needs that our people are reportedly unable to meet for themselves.

Such a listener could justifiably believe that, without Government prodding and support, Americans were too flabby to educate their children, build proper houses, clean up their cities, care for their aged, or show compassion for the unfortunate. He could believe that even our diversions are so decadent that a Cabinet officer must concern himself officially with the hiring practices of a professional football team and a Government agency must bring Federal standards to our television shows.

As reported from Washington, the American people are poorly educated, ill housed, out of work, badly entertained, and facing a bleak old age. This is hardly a picture to deter a determined aggressor.

In the interests of peace and a true picture of American fiber we should tell our foes about Indianapolis, where the people have long met their own problems without Federal subsidy; of Davenport, Iowa, which is on record as opposing Federal money for schools; of Carlsbad, N. Mex., where the school board has stated it wants no Federal intervention in local schools and the city council has refused to ask \$500,000 in Federal funds for a sewer system;

Of Italy, Tex., which preferred to rebuild itself rather than accept Federal funds after a tornado, and a lengthening honor roll of other localities which stand ready to resist invasions of freedom, not only from foreign governments but from their own as well.

Our President can make his warning to Mr. Khrushchev more convincing by pointing out that we can have whatever defense we need, along with sound money, and a stronger economy simply by restricting the Federal Government to its essential duties.

This isn't even austerity. It's merely commonsense.

The Real Chip on Kennedy's Shoulder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the continuing tension over the Berlin crisis is a source of great concern to all our citizens. We support the President in the moves he takes to uphold the cause of freedom there. Yet from time to time, we hear occasional doubts about this position.

One of the finest statements of the crucial and critical issue posed at Berlin appeared recently in the column of William E. Bohn in the New Leader magazine. I think it deserves the attention of all Members of the House and I submit it for the RECORD now:

THE REAL CHIP ON KENNEDY'S SHOULDER
(By William E. Bohn)

I have just received a very short letter from a very old friend about a recent column "The Old Men and the Smart Boys: Who Has the Right Slant on Berlin?" New Leader, July 31-August 7. The point of my little sermon was that some of our newspaper columnists seem to be afraid of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev's threatening posture, while some old men I know are not at all unnerved by the Berlin crisis. My

aged cronies were 100 percent in favor of supporting the firm policies of President Kennedy.

Suddenly came a jolting letter from the Pacific coast, written by my long-time friend, Ira D. Cardiff. Now Cardiff is a talented writer and he is a representative of that very group of men over 80 for whom I was speaking. Here is what he had to say:

"I have just read with interest your column of August 7. . . . I am going to ask you to be good enough to write me at once one or two good reasons why the United States should have any military contingents at all in Berlin at the present time. I read the President's speech carefully, but all he said was Berlin is a chip on my shoulder and I dare you to knock it off."

Cardiff knows as well as I do that 16 years after the war's end, no German peace treaty has yet been signed. Consequently, Germany remains occupied, and is theoretically still an enemy country. He knows too, that Soviet troops occupy East Germany. If the Western Powers withdrew their forces, the Russians, who now have enormous contingents encircling Berlin, would probably march into West Germany and take over the entire country, as they have in other places—Hungary, Czechoslovakia, etc. As long as U.S. troops occupy Germany and a treaty has not been signed, we have the right to participate in the conclusion of the peace and perhaps to create conditions which will make it possible for the German people to protect themselves against Russian attack.

But I have a feeling that my correspondent failed to put to me the main question which was on his mind. The chief point in our present foreign policy is not Berlin. Cardiff might well have asked: Why does the United States regard Russia as a probable enemy? Why do we spend \$50 billion a year for defense? Why do we scatter billions over the world to persuade other nations to line up with the West? Why, in short, are we engaged in a gigantic struggle in favor of democracy and against dictatorship?

Cardiff does the President a grave injustice when he suggests that his great July 25 speech on Berlin was a chip-on-the-shoulder affair. In his statement of the differences between East and West, Kennedy got down about as close to bedrock as a man can get:

"We cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin, either gradually or by force. For the fulfillment of our pledge to that city is essential to the morale and the security of Western Germany, to the unity of Western Europe, and to the faith of the free world."

These words put the struggle over Berlin in the perspective of the great world conflict. I cannot here undertake to explain to Cardiff what communism is or why it is locked in an unceasing battle against democracy. The war between East and West, between dictatorship and freedom, has been partly military and partly political, social and intellectual. (I think, incidentally, that the West has made a tragic blunder by underrating the propaganda aspect.) But no matter what its character, it has never stopped.

The followers of Marx have resorted to any means to gain an advantage in their drive for world conquest. No country is safe. With each nation that is allowed to fall to the Communists, the safety of the remaining free nations shrinks. That was what the President was discussing in his address to the Nation. That was the chip on his shoulder.

Free peoples create governments according to their taste and fashion their lives according to their individual dreams. To put it in the simplest terms, they want to spend their time, energy and money as they please, whether collectively or individually. Dictatorial governments operate in a manner

which produces the opposite results. At the heart of each dictatorship—and especially at the center of the great Communist complexes, Russia and China—a small corps of bosses directs government, business, education and, eventually, every subject's private life.

Khrushchev and his cohorts openly declare that they are bent upon the conquest of the world and that any means is justifiable in reaching that end. No tyrant in the history of the world has been more ruthless and cruel than these. What I am coming around to, Mr. Cardiff, is that the battle of Berlin is a part of the struggle for the world. If we stand up now with the best means at our disposal, we have a chance to win. Tomorrow may be too late.

Blank Cartridge Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it has been said many times during recent months that the American people are ahead of their leaders in supporting a policy of firmness toward our enemies.

I believe this is true.

By the same token, I believe this provides the opportunity to rally united support for such firmness.

Recently I received an excellent article written by a constituent of mine, Mr. M. J. Woodward, of Charlotte, Mich., expressing his views on the current national and world situation, including our "blank cartridge" diplomacy.

Under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I include this statement by Mr. Woodward:

In the following, I indict not the individual, but, rather, the weakness of the American body politic, where lust for power and personal ambition has led our national administrators to surrender honor, justice, and integrity to total political expediency and abandon the principles of true statesmanship.

In following the god of total political expediency, there being no right way to do a wrong thing, our national leaders have demoralized themselves.

Total political expediency has prompted jockeying for public favor and attempts to subjugate a strong, rugged, freedom-loving people to bureaucratic controls.

Total political expediency tried to remove nine old men and pack the U.S. Supreme Court with members of its own political faith, but it was this demoralization that stood adamant for unconditional surrender, prolonging the war and sacrificing thousands of lives, and then infamously giving away our advantages in Germany when victory came.

Through demoralization, we allowed the captive nations to be drawn behind the Iron Curtain, when a firm no could have stopped it. We had all the mechanics. In Korea we were not allowed to win. We paid homage to Red Russia in idealistic speeches.

Our planes were shot down, citizens stranded, property confiscated, and our flag trampled in the streets. We replied with a protest, sometimes.

America witnessed the struggling of imprisoned people in Hungary and Cuba, for

release from bondage, but, we the merchants of truth about liberty and freedom passed by on the other side.

We founded a Captive Nations Week in 1959 and that should have made our Goddess of Liberty blush with shame. We fall as a nation to stand for something, because our leaders haven't the courage to stand firm against anything.

Total political expediency can, and will, subvert us to zero as completely as communism, and we, us, the Americans, and our representatives can live a long time to regret the courage we didn't have to resist the things we knew were wrong from the beginning.

This Nation's imperative need is for her political leaders to come out of their respective corners, so bristling with patriotism they will not hesitate to throw the war harness on America and gird her to "run with patience the race that is set before her."

That official Washington will come out, bristling with patriotism, in the face of the waves of liberalism and intellectualism that are constantly eroding the shores of its judgment is unlikely, yet we will have hope for men to rise in extremity as they have been known to do in all history.

Peace is impossible and practically inconceivable with Russian communism, whose mills grind out inexorably the pattern and plan for world enslavement. We can count that day lost (and an asset to the enemy) whose sun sets without systematic harassment of Russia and exploitation of her every weakness, thus putting terror in her joints and marrow.

It is time, if we are not dedicated to become "Vanishing Americans," to stop this blank-cartridge business. Our efforts for 15 years at peaceful, liberal diplomatic negotiation with Russia have brought us to this crisis.

We can go ahead now with deadly intent to preserve the liberties we still possess, or wait and exercise the blessed complacent privilege of looking back at the day when we could have.

Development Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the foreign-aid bill, my distinguished colleague from Iowa, the Honorable FRED SCHWENGEL, called my attention to an interesting and informative letter he had received from Dr. James A. Robinson, assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Northwestern University. At the request of my colleague, under unanimous consent, I am inserting Dr. Robinson's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with my comments on the important points he raises in his letter on the subject of the development research program authorized in the foreign-aid legislation.

Dr. Robinson's letter follows:

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill., August 14, 1961.

Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SCHWENGEL: I am writing you about a provision in the Act for International Development. Title V would authorize

\$20 million for "development research." This is an encouraging move by the administration toward using and promoting research in economics and the other social sciences in the hope of making foreign economic assistance a more successful instrument of U.S. foreign policy. Although the amount is small compared to the total foreign-aid request, and although this provision has not received much attention compared to the more controversial features of the bill, a modest amount for research might do more to help improve the effectiveness of foreign aid than many other more expensive provisions.

My interpretation of the presentation materials by the Department of State and the ICA is that this money would be used for "contract research" with universities and private study groups. There is, of course, ample precedent for contract research as a means of gaining new knowledge and applying it to practical governmental problems. The various branches of the armed services have long had offices of research which subsidize private groups and universities by contracting for special studies. Compared to the amount of money and effort which have previously been devoted to the evaluation of our mutual security programs and for research to improve them, \$20 million is a significant sum.

I hope that discussion on the House floor will elicit from the committee and other Representatives that it is the intent of Congress that this provision be interpreted broadly enough that it will allow for research in addition to what is sometimes narrowly conceived as "developmental economics." That is a very vital subject in understanding and helping with the modernization of new nations. Other disciplines also have significant knowledge to contribute to policy-making and execution. For example, cultural anthropology is relevant to determining what kinds of projects will be best received among different kinds of people. Research in public administration might reveal why our aid programs sometimes do not reach the people for whom they are intended but instead support unpopular, corrupt, and decadent regimes. There are many examples of how scholarly research by several academic fields could help AID better achieve its ends. I hope that Congress will intend that AID adopt a broad interpretation of development research.

The State Department presentation indicated that these sums could go toward contracting with existing research institutions or establishing new research programs. A broad interpretation, which would result in contracting with a wide range of research centers, seems to me necessary for two further reasons. First, the Government should not inadvertently discriminate against research in some fields of social inquiry relevant to this problem at the expense of other fields. Many people have lamented that the NDEA favors science and language while neglecting the humanities. Similarly, I think it would be unfortunate to exclude social studies other than economics, especially a particular branch of economics, from this provision. Second, a broad conception of development research will tap a wide range of different persons and institutions and assure Congress that the Government will not be limited to a small number of sources for research and ideas.

The language of the bill is quite adequate, so far as my nonlegal reading indicates. What counts is its interpretation. An amendment is not necessary, and at this date would be impracticable. However, I hope that the House debate will establish a legislative record to guide the administration in the interpretation and implementation of the act.

This is a significant step forward, and whatever the outcome of the more contro-

versial features of the act, this provision already makes it a better bill than those of previous years. A broad interpretation of title V will further strengthen the values which new research can give to foreign aid.

Cordially,

JAMES A. ROBINSON,
Assistant Professor.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is always helpful for us Members of Congress to receive such pertinent and well thought out recommendations on pending legislation. I am particularly pleased to comply with the request of Congressman SCHWENGEL to comment on Dr. Robinson's letter and I wish to state that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has devoted much time and study to the Executive branch presentation of data in support of the Development Research Program. I believe the following comments will help to assure Dr. Robinson that the program will be based on soundly conceived lines; and that many of his suggestions will be followed in its implementation.

The role of the proposed development research program can be described in terms of the nature of the research to be encouraged and the primary functions to be performed:

(a) Nature of research to be supported: The Development Research Program will focus on scientific investigations of benefit to the U.S. program of development assistance. The test of relevance to be applied will be the degree to which a given research effort gives promise of providing results which can be usefully applied in the assistance program itself. The research program will, therefore, emphasize applied research. However, desirable basic research on many issues or subjects may be, the program will not be prepared to sponsor such activity unless this test of usefulness is met. However, either basic or applied research may in some instances require a long period to produce fully mature results. Where the probable usefulness to development assistance is established, we must be prepared to support sustained research efforts.

The research to be undertaken must often cut across traditional classifications of scientific knowledge. This is one of the characteristic features of the development process and of the research that is needed to support it. It is more useful for this reason to categorize the research to be done in terms of the developmental problems and opportunities it is addressed to than by the areas of knowledge involved. Many different kinds of knowledge will need to be enlisted, and communication between the different areas will be highly important. Generally, the research will be in four broad categories:

1. The identification and modification of the factors in a society that determine the success or failure of economic, social or technological innovation;

2. The collection or development of scientific information that has been bypassed or fallen into disuse in our own society, but is needed to advance modernization elsewhere;

3. The simplification and adaptation of technologies to fit conditions in the less developed countries; and

4. The selective support of basic research.

(b) Functions to be performed: The development research program will perform three main functions:

1. A liaison function, by which research being carried out through other governmental programs or under private auspices is reviewed and examined so that results useful for the aid program are uncovered and used to the maximum extent. This implies

a clearinghouse activity which can be of help in guiding the growth of the community of research facilities as well as of benefit to the assistance program itself.

2. A support function, by which problems or requirements encountered in development assistance programs that can be usefully made the subject of research are identified and research on them is encouraged and supported. This implies a readiness to strengthen existing facilities where they are weak, and to establish new ones as needed.

3. An execution function, by which the results of relevant research application are made available to operating staffs and personnel in usable form and are placed in operation where feasible. This will involve serious attention to the large issue of training future generations of personnel qualified to work in development assistance. It will also mean a feedback of actual field experience to the people engaged in continuing research projects.

In Defense of Project Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 12, 1961

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I was astounded to read in the Washington Post of September 8, 1961, that an unnamed "high ranking International Cooperation Administration official" is apparently raising objections to any further Government support of the American mercy ship *Hope* and has been quoted as regarding the vessel as "showcase democracy."

It is particularly difficult to square this published point of view with the formally signed statement of Assistant Secretary of State Brooks Hays, dated March 8, 1961, in which Mr. Hays informed the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that "the Department welcomes and supports this proposed congressional commendation of this project"—referring to Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, commending Project Hope.

The Department of State's official report to the Senate Committee continued to point out that the U.S. Government has provided substantial assistance to Project Hope, including \$2.7 million of mutual security program funds to place the surplus Navy hospital ship in operating condition, and an additional \$500,000 of mutual security program funds as an interest-free loan—supplementing hundreds of thousands of dollars in private American contributions for the project, collected all over the country.

In the words of Assistant Secretary Hays:

The Department has been impressed by the cordial reception accorded in Indonesia to *Hope I* and its fine medical and dental staff. We fully expect that the response in future ports of call will be equally favorable.

There can be little doubt, Mr. Speaker, of the enthusiasm of Assistant Secretary Hays of the Department of State for the accomplishments of the hospital ship *Hope* thus far. Since his report specifi-

cally refers to Bureau of the Budget clearance, it should certainly be clear that Mr. Hays was speaking for the administration when he addressed the Senate Committee in March.

Shortly after receipt of this report, the Senate formally passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 8, and I have been informed by Chairman Morgan that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs expects to consider it soon.

In view of the assurance given on the floor of the House during debate of the foreign assistance bill, only a few weeks ago, it seems clear that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regards Project Hope in a highly favorable light and fully expected that funds authorized in title II of that measure would be available for support when needed. Specific reference was made during that debate to the availability of section 211 funds for *Hope*, and this was assuredly a factor of some importance in the support of the measure in the House.

Now we read, in a Washington newspaper, that some anonymous ICA official has doubts about the project's value, questioning such policies as flying the American flag and paying U.S. maritime wages to its crew. Furthermore, a special assistant to the President is quoted as saying that "The President has reached no decision in the matter."

Mr. Speaker, I have no personal doubt that the President, on review of the facts, will conclude that the job being done by Project Hope is an outstanding example of American achievement in the continuing effort to build good will throughout the world, and to bring the people of the world closer together in a bond of mutual trust and friendship.

When the unknown critic of Project Hope told the Washington reporter that "working together is better than showcase democracy," he gave convincing evidence of his ignorance of procedures aboard the hospital ship in foreign ports.

One of the most important features of the *Hope's* mission has been the cooperation of its staff with local professional people in every port visited.

In Indonesia, for example, *Hope* records show that more than 200 Indonesian doctors and 300 Indonesian nurses participated in the joint medical program of training and treatment.

In Vietnam, more than 200 Vietnamese nurses took part in shipboard training and treatment programs, and teams from the *Hope's* staff worked ashore in clinics, in 6 civilian hospitals and in Saigon's military hospital.

Dr. William B. Walsh, president of Project Hope, has consistently emphasized the importance of partnership with local doctors and nurses in the foreign countries visited by the ship, and has stressed working together with local people in both the training and treatment programs.

In Indonesia, Project Hope reports that more than 18,000 patients were treated by the joint Indonesian-American committees, and 700 major operations were performed. In Vietnam, there were more than 10,000 patients, and more than 500 major operations.

Mass inoculations of children with training of local vaccination teams in Vietnam; more than 800 lectures and seminars in Indonesia; the introduction of oral surgery for the first time in Vietnam; the provision of more than 8,000 books and medical journals for hospitals, clinics, and libraries in the two countries; substantial medical supplies in both—these are some of the substantial achievements of the effort so lightly described as "showcase democracy."

Mr. Speaker, it is not hard to understand why the "high-ranking official" quoted in the Washington Post elected to remain unnamed.

If mail from home is any indication of public sentiment, the people are overwhelmingly enthusiastic about the good ship *Hope* and its mercy mission abroad. I am sure they will continue to support it with voluntary contributions, in increasing sums, as they learn of its good work and its need for their support.

I am equally sure, Mr. Speaker, that the relatively modest sums of American tax dollars which go into this project—to help send an American vessel under our own flag on its mercy mission abroad—will have far greater support at home than will many of the projects conceived by our unknown official in ICA.

This certainly does not mean there is no merit in his reported suggestion that some of our surplus hospital ships could be made available to friendly nations, for their own operation to relieve distress and spread medical knowledge. Without doubt many countries could operate hospital ships at a lower cost than we do, and be of great help to their people.

But surely it is no sin to have an American flag flying proudly above such a vessel, and to pay American wages to the seamen who sail her, and to invest a very small percentage of our foreign-assistance funds in such an undertaking.

Children Handicapped by Deafness

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 11, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I support this bill which will establish a program of grants in aid for the training of teachers of the deaf. The problem of the deaf and the hard of hearing is one of the least understood, and most neglected, of all of the growing health problems that face this country. It is national and international in scope. A greater number of babies are born each year afflicted with this tragic, lonely handicap of deafness.

Medical science has not yet discovered the cure for deafness at birth. But the life long handicap that results from deafness—that forever isolates the deaf child or person from all other human beings, that forces a segregation of its own just as demoralizing as any other kind of segregation—can be overcome. The enactment of H.R. 9011 is one way to begin.

It would give us, in greater quantity and quality, the indispensable weapon against the handicap of deafness—trained teachers.

In the 86th Congress and again in this Congress I introduced legislation which would reflect a national response to the national problem of providing Federal funds to train teachers of those handicapped by deafness. I did so with some knowledge of the extent of the problem and an awareness of the enormous waste, in terms of the capacity of deaf persons to be useful and productive members of society, caused by the disaster of deafness. It is a disaster, I assure you, that can strike any home, any parent, any child.

There are in our midst today some 30,000 deaf children of school age with an expected increase of 400 every year. The number continues to rise while the number of specialists dedicated to train these children to take their rightful place in our society, with full opportunity to make their own way, is woefully small, and diminishing in relation to the mounting need.

To train these children, we need some 500 specialists annually. At the moment, there are only 177 such teachers in training in the special teacher training centers. In June 1959 only 127 such teachers were graduated. These figures alone manifest the critical shortage of trained personnel in this field.

From a study of the reports supplied me and conversation with informed sources, I am convinced that 80 percent of these handicaps are remediable. I have seen what can be done for these children if proper training is afforded them. Let me give you two examples of the kind of thing that can be done in this field.

In my own congressional district in Manhattan are located the largest public junior high school for the deaf in the country—Junior High 47, and the country's best known private school—primary and secondary—the Lexington School for the Deaf. In these remarkable schools I have seen the miracle of the deaf child's transition from the silent world of the deaf to the other world of communication, language and speech. After all, the chief thing that elevates human beings above all other species is an intelligence that enables them to communicate by speech.

The Lexington School happens to be a private school, but it charges no tuition and it receives most of its support from the State. It takes children beginning from age 3 or 4 up and gives them a high school education. Many go on to college. By the time they are finished they are equipped to lead normal lives in the adult world and to communicate with others.

The teachers in this school, and in junior high 47 must have very special qualifications. Not only must they have all of the qualifications of high school teachers in the normal school, but they must be specially trained to communicate with the deaf. The young men and women who make this their lifework must, after having met all the other standards for high school teaching, take

specialized postgraduate courses, and pay tuition for this purpose. The Lexington School has a postgraduate training school of its own, which is well known around the country and abroad. Most of the teachers in training here have to borrow the funds in order to pay the relatively modest tuition. On top of this, they have to live and, in big cities where the problem is most acute, moderate- or low-income housing is not available. The Lexington School is in a position to provide living accommodations for many of these dedicated persons. But food, clothes, and other costs of living must be borne by them.

Most schools cannot even afford living accommodations. Then when these teachers are finished and are qualified to take on the task of teaching the deaf, they are often paid less than the high school teachers in the regular school system.

Can this be right? Is there any wonder that there exists such a shortage of teachers in this field? And we must remember that teaching the deaf requires a personal dedication and a steadfastness that few other specialized professions require. It is the hardest possible physical work. In addition to personal dedication it requires a persistence and a patience that most people do not have, including most teachers. Why then should we permit conditions to exist that make the cause of these young teachers and hopeful teachers so much more difficult than it has to be?

A properly staffed school specializing in the teaching of the deaf, if adequately supported, can become the laboratory for the advancement of teaching techniques in every school and at every educational level the country over. If methods can be devised, and they are already in process, for the advancement of learning in specialized schools such as Junior High School 47, and the Lexington School of New York City, they will have general application. After all, the essence of education is to teach students to teach themselves—to give them the necessary tools with which to build their own intellectual houses. The job of the teacher is to communicate with the student. Therefore, the development of methods and techniques for communication between the teacher of the deaf and the deaf student will certainly be of immeasurable benefit also to the teacher who is seeking to establish lines of communication between students with hearing, but who still do not hear.

What I am suggesting, is that one of the soundest investments we can make toward the advancement of learning in the United States is to multiply 100-fold our effort in educational laboratories such as the two I have mentioned by adequately staffing them with specially trained teachers.

The specific Federal approach adopted in this bill now before the House is but one step. This is a modest proposal, calling for Federal assistance through a \$3 million, 2-year program of grants-in-aid to accredited public and nonprofit institutions of higher education which are approved training centers for teach-

ers of the deaf. I am pleased beyond measure that the House is at long last taking definitive action of this bill. The more I examine this problem, the more I wonder why we have delayed as long as we have.

No California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 14, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of the beloved and respected Leo Carrillo a lot of California passed away with him. Leo Carrillo represented California both past and present like no one else could. He came from the dignified and proud dons of early California. Yet lived to see his native State become the second largest in the Nation and he gave his talents, energy and ability to make California great.

He was a respected and loved friend of mine for many years.

The following editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner and News article tells of his contribution to California and of his proud and glorious past:

LEO CARRILLO

One of the last and most admirable ties of our community with a chivalric past was dissolved when Leo Carrillo took his last leave of the country and the people he loved so well.

By profession a fine actor, by nature a true gentleman, Mr. Carrillo personified to generations of Angelenos the unaffected grace of our California forebears.

He was gifted with gaiety, warm in comradeship, untouched by malice, fertile in resource.

The void he leaves can be filled only by grateful memory of the mission he gave himself to fulfill: To forge an indestructible link of friendship between the two great peoples who gave form and spirit to our civic home.

LEO CARRILLO, DESCENDANT OF DONS, DIES OF CANCER

"Mr. California" is dead.

Pudgy, lovable Leo Carrillo, a movie star more than 30 years and as familiar a sight at Rose Tournament parades as the roses themselves, played out his final scene at 5:55 p.m. Sunday in his ranchhouse in Santa Monica Canyon.

Unconscious since Thursday, the 81-year-old descendant of Spanish dons was a victim of terminal cancer complicated by a failing heart.

He had fought cancer for 8 years, keeping the nature of his ailment a closely guarded secret, and had undergone several operations in the battle, the latest surgery having been performed September 1.

At his bedside in the old Carrillo homestead at 639 East Channel Road when the last curtain was rung down were his daughter, Antoinette, who had resided there with him for many years, and two friends of many years' standing.

They were Jack Tolbert, foreman of Leo's Vista ranch, and Owen E. Meehan, Jr., former FBI agent. One of Leo's brothers, Otis, arrived a few minutes after death came for the veteran actor.